# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT...WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 6. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1852. WHOLE NO. 630.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, Two Dollars per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.


## The Southern Press, South.

### THE WHIG PLATFORM.

A CONFLICT OF RECORDS—MATERIAL ERROR, IF NOT GROSS FRAUD, SOMEWHERE.

We publish below, from the Baltimore *Sun* of yesterday, what purports to be "The official platform of the Whig National Convention." It appears over the signatures of all the officers of the convention, and it is formally attested as "a true copy" by the secretary of that body. As thus published, it bears every mark of authenticity. Yet in several vitally important particulars it conflicts with the full and careful reports which have been previously published of the platform *as adopted by the convention*, as we shall proceed to show.

In the *National Intelligencer* of Monday last, there is a very elaborate report of the proceedings of the convention in its Friday and Saturday sessions of last week. The report is introduced by the *Intelligencer* by a well-deserved editorial compliment to the "exertions of the excellent reporters" by whom it was furnished. This report gives the whole series of resolutions, as read at the secretary's desk by Mr. Ashmun, of Massachusetts, in behalf of the Committee on Resolutions. An apparently *verbatim* report of the debate upon the adoption of the resolutions is then given; and finally the *vote by States* which adopted, without amendment, the resolutions, *as read by Mr. Ashmun*, is given as follows:

A vote by States having been demanded, the roll of the States was called, and the platform resolutions were adopted by the following vote:

| | Yeas. | Nays. |
|---|---|---|
| Maine | 4 | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 5 | — |
| Vermont | 5 | — |
| Massachusetts | 13 | — |
| Rhode Island | 4 | — |
| *Connecticut | 4 | 1 |
| †New York | 12 | 22 |
| New Jersey | 7 | — |
| Pennsylvania | 21 | 6 |
| Delaware | 3 | — |
| Maryland | 8 | — |
| †Virginia | 15 | — |
| North Carolina | 10 | — |
| South Carolina | 8 | — |
| Georgia | 10 | — |
| Alabama | 9 | — |
| Mississippi | 7 | — |
| Louisiana | 6 | — |
| Ohio | 8 | 15 |
| Kentucky | 12 | — |
| Tennessee | 12 | — |
| Indiana | 7 | 6 |
| Illinois | 7 | 5 |
| Missouri | 9 | — |
| Arkansas | 4 | — |
| Michigan | — | 6 |
| Florida | 3 | — |
| Texas | 4 | — |
| Iowa | 4 | — |
| Wisconsin | 4 | 1 |
| California | 4 | — |
| Total | 227 | 66 |

* One declined. † One vote lost. ‡ One vacancy.

Loud, long, and startling, were the demonstrations of applause that followed the announcement of this vote.

Now, this report of the *Intelligencer* gives the eighth resolution, as read by Mr. Ashmun, and adopted by the convention, in the following words:

*Eighth.* That the series of acts of the Thirty-First Congress—the Act known as the Fugitive Slave Law included—are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States, as a settlement, in principle and substance, of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace; and so far as they are concerned, we will maintain them and insist upon their strict enforcement until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation, to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand, and the abuse of their powers on the other, not impairing their present efficiency; and we deprecate all further agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation whenever, wherever, or however the attempt may be made; and we will maintain this system as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union.

The resolution appears, in the same words as previously published in the *Intelligencer* of Saturday, in what purports to be an editorial summary of the Friday's proceedings of the convention. In the *Republic* of Saturday, the resolution is given as adopted by the convention in the same words. It appeared also as adopted in the same words in the Baltimore journals of Saturday, and has been so published all over the country. In our issue of Sunday morning last, we commented at length on the terms of the resolution as thus adopted, contrasting it with the form in which it was originally presented by the Southern caucus, and concurred in by the Webster and Fillmore delegates from the North; and we showed that the word *compromise*, and the whole idea of a *covenant* settlement, and of a final settlement, had been struck out of it by the Committee on Resolutions before they would report it to the convention and before the convention would adopt it. We showed, also, that, as thus changed by the committee and adopted by the convention, the resolution put *all* the acts of the Thirty-first Congress on the same footing, and refused to put the Fugitive Slave Law on the ground of a constitutional mandate requiring it, or on the ground of a part and parcel of a *covenant* adjustment of the sectional difficulties. We held that all these most important changes of the resolution by the committee were bad and indefensible, and scarcely compatible with the idea of good faith in the matter; and we insisted that in adopting the resolution in this form the convention had perpetrated at once a blunder in the North and a crime against the South.

The apparently elaborate fidelity of the reports which gave us the resolution in this shape, and the entire *consistency* of all the reports of the resolution, left no doubt on our minds that it was given just as Mr. Ashmun read it and the convention adopted it. But had any such doubt existed as to the accuracy of the terms of the resolution, it would have been completely removed by what subsequently took place upon the subject in the convention. Governor Johnston, of Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Resolutions, rose in his place in the convention, *on Saturday morning*, to call attention to the form in which the resolutions had been published in the newspapers as adopted by the convention on the preceding day. In the *fifth* resolution—that relating to revenue—Gov. Johnston detected an error in the newspaper statement of its terms; but with the *eighth* resolution before him in the same newspapers, in the impaired and emasculated form above given, *he found no error whatever*. Here is the report, from the *Intelligencer* of Monday, of what Gov. Johnston said of the fifth resolution. Of the eighth he said nothing. It will be observed that his remarks, however, led the reporter to *verify* the report of the whole series, and to republish them in Monday's *Intelligencer as thus verified*. It is from this verified report that we copy the *eighth* resolution, as above given in its weakened form:

GOV. JOHNSTON. I observe by the papers of this morning, to which my attention has been called—for I do not read the newspapers very much—that in the publication of the fifth resolution it is not in the same form in which it was passed by the committee, of which I was a member. The important amendment which was introduced into that resolution by the Committee on Resolutions is omitted in the resolution as published in the papers of this morning. I make this statement for the purpose of ascertaining whether the journal is correct in relation to this point, and that public attention may be called to the fact that the resolutions were not published in the papers as they were passed by the convention.

The PRESIDENT. The secretary informs the Chair that his own record is correct; and if there is any error, it is on the part of the newspapers. The chairman of the Committee on Resolutions has examined the journal, and states that it is correct.

GOV. JOHNSTON. I ask that the fifth resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT suggested to the convention that an official copy of the resolutions as they passed would be prepared.

MR. ASHMUN. I desire to say that the fifth resolution, as it stands upon the journal, is just as it was read by me yesterday, and precisely as it was adopted by the committee. I am sure the ears of the gentleman from Pennsylvania could not have deceived him, because the resolution was so important that it must have attracted his attention when read at the desk.

GOV. JOHNSTON. I have no doubt that the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions read the resolutions correctly to the convention. I have made no insinuation against the gentleman, and therefore presume that his explanation was unnecessary to that extent.

The resolution was then read. The omitted portion referred to by Mr. Johnston was inserted in the *National Intelligencer*; but we republish in a preceding column the whole series, as in our first publication there were some inaccuracies, arising from the haste with which the notes were taken as they were read by Mr. Ashmun.

Now, it will be remembered that the entire debate upon the platform had hinged on the *eighth* resolution. No other resolution of the whole series had been alluded to in the discussions before the convention. None other had apparently been thought of. Men were giving all their attention to the resolution on the sectional issues. Yet it now appears that while one of the members of the committee was lynx-eyed enough to detect the minutest error in the newspaper report of the revenue resolution, he was stone-blind—as indeed, were all the rest of the convention—to the most *astonishing discrepancy* that we have ever seen in the report of the sectional resolution, when compared with what is now published as the *official record*.

For, now compare with the eighth resolution, as above given, the following wholly different statement of its terms, as given in the *official* form over the signature of the officers of the convention. Here is the *official* resolution:

*Eighth.* The series of acts of the Thirty-First Congress, commonly known as the Compromise or adjustment (the act for the recovery of fugitives from labour included), are received and acquiesced in by the Whigs of the United States as a final settlement, in principle and substance, of the subjects to which they relate; and, so far as these acts are concerned, we will maintain them, and insist on their strict enforcement, until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand, and the abuse of their powers on the other—not impairing their present efficiency to carry out the requirements of the constitution; and we deprecate all further agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever, or however made; and we will maintain this settlement as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union.

What a change is here! Instead of the emasculated and mutilated resolution which was reported to have been "read by Mr. Ashmun," and "adopted by the convention," here is all, and more than all, that the Southern Whigs reported. Here is "*compromise*" or covenant—here is "*finality*"—here is "*constitutional mandate*" or requirement. Every idea is here which we noted the omission and careful erasure of in the resolution which the convention adopted.

In this state of facts, we aver that here is every evidence of fraud or bad faith somewhere.

We affirm that, as the case now stands, no man can believe that the convention *knowingly* adopted the resolution in the form now officially given it.

We affirm that every fact in the case goes to show that the convention intended to vote for it, and did vote for it, in a very different and far weaker form.

If this were not so, why was this all-important resolution wholly ignored and unnoticed when Gov. Johnston brought up the reported terms of the resolutions for correction? If the resolution *was* read and adopted in its *official* shape, then why did Southern Whigs permit it to go all over the country in terms utterly inaccurate and false, and divested of essential parts of its true meaning? If this course was taken *intentionally*, it is on its face a gross cheat upon the country, and doubtless upon the convention. If, on the other hand, it be a blunder, it is the most inexplicable blunder on record.

It therefore behooves all concerned in this matter to let the country know at once how it stands.

It is for Mr. Ashmun to tell us this: the terms of the resolution as read by him for adoption by the convention. Did he read it as given in the *official* form or as given and apparently subsequently verified by the reporters? If he read in the *official* shape, why did he not correct the most material errors into which the reporters had fallen, and which they had sent all over the country?

It is for Governor Johnston to tell us why he could see the *mote* in the report of the revenue resolution, and could not see the *beam* in the report of the far more important sectional resolution.

It is for the President and Secretary of the convention to tell us *not* how the resolution stands on the journal—for *that* they do tell us over their signatures—but *how* was the resolution read from their desk, and voted on by the convention.

Until these things are fully explained, not a small portion of the Whig party will be found to believe that, by some strange process, either of mistake or of design, they have been drawn in their convention into a position upon the compromise measures alike new and unwelcome to them as Whigs, and in flat contradiction with all their past votes and declarations, and all their wishes and designs for the future.

Especially will these men wish to know from Gen. Scott which platform he on *Monday afternoon* accepted by telegraph. Was it the only platform which had up to that date been published by the reporters, or was it the official platform, which made its first appearance on *Tuesday morning*?

And, finally, the people will wish to know whether and how far they are to regard this state of the business as a gross electioneering fraud perpetrated upon them under the "solemn plausibilities" of a Whig National Convention.—*Washington Union.*

### THE DEMOCRATIC FINALITY.

THE unanimous adoption, by the National Democratic Convention, of resolutions of acquiescence in the Compromise Measures as a final disposition in Congress of all the agitating issues which they involved, embracing the maintenance and faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, is one of the most gratifying and encouraging events of that assemblage. It proves that the entire party, in all sections of the Union, is sound upon these great questions. It had been apprehended that some of the Democrats in New York and Massachusetts especially would have raised opposition to an approval of this latter law, but the result shews that, under the influence of great national and patriotic counsels, they have abandoned their insane higher-law notions, and returned to the strict constitutional faith of the party. The only firebrand, Rantoul, was promptly and justly ejected from the Convention, and the Barnburners, having achieved their one purpose of defeating Cass and Buchanan, were content to renounce their late fanatical tenets, and placed themselves under the time-honoured banner of the party, bearing for its motto, justice to all sections, and a faithful execution of the laws and Constitution of the country.

This is one of the most gratifying pledges to the South, which has occurred for many a year, that we shall have justice done to our rights, our institutions protected against the assaults of Abolition, and our States be permitted to retain an equal and respectable position in the Confederay. The nomination of Gen. Pierce, a Northern man, pledged by all his previous life, and by these circumstances attending his selection, affords an additional guarantee that our brethren beyond the Potomac are disposed to act towards us in a spirit of justice, magnanimity and fraternal sympathy. This view is also fully endorsed and fortified by the nomination of William R. King, upon the same ticket, a man who comes nearer being an embodiment of the true principles, sentiments, and feelings of the South, than almost any other statesman in the Union.

While this is the noble and praiseworthy position of the Democracy, what, on the other hand, are the prospects of the Whig party? Their Convention is to meet in a few days, but as to its probable action, it may be truly said that "clouds, shadows and darkness rest upon it." It is almost positively certain that Scott will be its nominee, and that no declaration of fidelity or adhesion to the Compromise, and, last of all, the Fugitive Slave Law, will be given; Seward and his myrmidons will bear rule. The silence of death—ruinous and fatal as the grave—is the best that we can expect from them, as to these—all vital measures—while the probability is even strong that they will, with a bold hand, unfurl the Higher-Law Banner, as the standard of Northern Whiggery, bearing for its motto "*Va victis!*" to the South, and go on to seize the Presidency, by the sole strength of Northern majorities.

This is now the attitude of the two parties. The Democracy are, as they have just shown, in the most solemn and public manner, thoroughly sound and safe; while the Whigs are confessedly demoralized and Abolitionized through more than one half the Union.

In such a view, what Southern man, no matter what may have been his political connexion heretofore, can hesitate on which side to range himself, in the coming contest! We trust that if the result we anticipate should occur, party prejudices will no longer exercise their fatal sorcery upon the minds of our people, but that they will all be found united as one man under the proud Constitutional standard upon which the honoured names of Pierce and King are inscribed.—*Mobile Daily Register.*

### THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—OUR CHOICE.

THE sanguine and hopeful among us, as to the upshot of the universal huckstering which now pervades all parties and sections, for place and perquisites, must confess that, practically and truthfully considered, the South has little to gain in the success of either side.

The utmost concessions which Southern politicians expect to extort from the insatiate appetite of Northern vandalism, is the finality of the Compromise, and the maintenance of the Fugitive Law. It was the struggle for this pitiable boon which, a few weeks since, dismembered the Whig party, rending asunder the comrades of an hundred fields. Truly a trifling cause, for an effect so stupendous. Of what value to us is the assertion of the finality of the Compromise; or of the fugitive law? Why, the South has cried aloud against the desolating plunder of the Compromise, and we in Carolina have just emerged from a contest in which parties rivalled each other in swearing hostility and resistance to its insidious but fatal decrees.

And the operation of the fugitive law has already impelled us to the unwilling conviction, that it is far better to have it stricken from the statute book than to remain as it now is, and as it ever must be, utterly nugatory for its avowed purposes, and potential only in multiplying extortion, and shedding the blood of slaveholders. Yet parties and politicians are wrangling about these things, as though the assertion of the finality of the Compromise and the fugitive law was not the re-enactment, and finishing stroke, which enstamp upon us indelible shame and wrong. Worse than this, Southern men are found eagerly entering the lists, and waiting only for the bare promise of these crumbs, to commit soul and body to the struggle and fortunes of the campaign.

We know that this acquiesence in the Compromise, for the sake of the Union, has won for the South the praise of magnanimity, but such unfitting and deceitful praise has emanated from traitor lips, and cowardly hearts. Acquiescence in deliberate wrong never was magnanimous in any people.

Were it here the sure symbol of peace to our home and institutions, we too might pocket the flattery and be quiet. But his are indeed feeble eyes, which fail to see, that as the Star of Southern resistance "'gins to pale his ineffectual fire," the sun of the Northern empire steadily treads aloft the path to his meridian splendour. We therefore repeat our conviction, that the admission of the finality of the Compromise, and the fugitive law, confers no benefits upon the South. It is rather the treacherous prize, by which she will be again seduced into the shambles, to be strangled and butchered by her Northern masters.

Who then is the man for the South, and what should be his politics? We want no Compromiser, no go-between, that the Union may have peace, and the North all the spoils.

We want no timid, would-be just President, who sees that the outside of the platter be clean, but who will not, and would not, if he could, make a clean sweep of the Villany which now revels in the Departments. We want no Northern man with Southern principles, nor Southern man whose three hundred slaves, and thousand bags of Cotton, shall dupe us into hope, while he is made the ready tool of log-rollers, and tricksters. We have tried such men, and we want no more of them.

The most rapid and reckless fanatic, the most unscrupulous and corrupt financiers, whose veins are burning with the lust of power, for himself and his section, is emphatically the man for the South. Paradoxical as it may seem, the worst man is the best for us. We know that our peace-loving friends will start at this avowal. They are not yet sick of that policy of Compromise which is insidiously and rapidly ruining our beloved land. So long as this policy is dominant, the South will continue to hug her chains. There must be some stern and terrible remedy applied to stir her people from their trance. With such a man in the White House, surrounded by a Cabinet of chosen Compeers, and backed by a powerful party, exultant, and madly pressing onwards, the regeneration of the South would be near at hand.

Let corruption and outrage choke up forever the channels of Compromise; let Consolidation boldly tread down the rights of the States, and fanaticism riot over the Constitution, until the last throb of blind love for the Union, is pressed out of the hearts of our people, and we should then see the South wake up, and stirring her now dormant limbs, prepare to repel the wrong, and assert the right. Better, far better for us, that fanaticism should at once outstrip the bounds of toleration, and leap to its climax, than by stealthy inroads despoil us of our all.—*Charleston S. C. Mercury.*

### THE TWO SHAPES OF THE WHIG PLATFORM.

AFTER a delay of only a week, the two central Whig organs here have given what purports to be their explanation of the fact that the Whig Convention suffered its most important resolution to be circulated for four days all over the country in a shape *essentially* different from that in which it is alleged to have been adapted and officially recorded.

The substance of the explanation is, that the reporters copied the resolution as taken down by one of their number, who did not *verify* his own copy.

Let this statement pass; and let those who *can do so* fail to see in either a most extraordinary indifference, or a dishonest design somewhere, as to the shape in which the all-important resolution in question should be sent forth to make its first and deepest impression on the public mind.

But be it always remembered that the main point in the case is not even *touched* by the above explanation. That point is, that Governor Johnston, a member of the Committee on Resolutions, in the convention, on Saturday morning, brought up *for correction* the newspaper report of the platform; the convention entertained the subject; Governor Johnston pointed out the omission of a single word in the report on the *fifth* revenue resolution, and had that report corrected, and *that* resolution forthwith correctly published; while as to the report of the *eighth* or compromise resolution, neither Governor Johnston, nor anybody else in the committee or the convention, had either eyes to see or tongue to mention the strange omission of the *vital* words "*Compromise*," "*final*," "*constitutional requirements*," which words constitute the very gist and the whole obligatory force of the resolution as now given officially.

We ask Gov. Johnston, or Mr. Ashmun, or the Whig organs, or anybody else concerned in the business, to tell us why, in the presence of errors so numerous and so essential in the report of the only resolution about which either the convention or the public mind had been keenly excited and solicitous, the work of correction was confined to a single word or phrase in *another* resolution which elicited no word of debate in the convention when the question of adopting the whole series was before that body? Tell us why the attention and time of the convention were applied to the correction of a single resolution which all were agreed upon, while in the same series *another* resolution—as to the proper terms of which there was great and violent contrariety of opinion and feeling, threatening even the breaking up of the convention, as it had already disorganized the party—was sent without correction through the country, bristling all over with the most material errors, so as to change its whole significance and scope? This is a fact which can by no means be saddled upon the reporters. This is a fact which the convention, and none but the convention or those authorized to speak for it, can even *begin* to explain. It will be for the people deeply interested in this matter to decide whether *anybody* can at this time give a satisfactory explanation of a fact so utterly without precedent and so full of suspicion.

There is another point worth bearing in mind. It is currently reported that *Gov. Johnston himself*—whose position and course on the sectional controversy are well known—drew and presented in the Committee on Resolutions the resolution on the sectional issues, in the equivocal and worthless shape in which it was, according to the reporters, adopted by the convention, and in which it was certainly first given to the country. What was done with the resolution subsequently, we do not hear until we see it officially published in its new and very different shape. If such be the paternity of the resolution in its most conveniently equivocal shape, then the fact that it was permitted to circulate in that shape after its adoption becomes a good deal more luminous. For the Whigs of Lancaster and Alleghany, and Chester counties, in Pennsylvania, and for the kindred Whigs of the Ohio Reserve, the resolution will be a bad business any way; and if a *topic for the stump* in those regions has thus been carefully provided in the first weak shape of the resolution, it will not be the only nor the last, though it may be one of the most flagrant and scandalous, instances of Whig double-dealing before the people.

One word more. Can it be that Gen. Scott's *excessively* hasty telegraphic acceptance of the nomination *and the platform* at once, within twenty minutes after his nomination and *before* the platform had been officially published, had anything to do with this precious arrangement by which the platform had been first given to the country in a mutilated and worthless shape? Such a course on Gen. Scott's part is wholly without precedent. There is no particle of evidence that he had any *official* information that there was any platform at all, or even that any nomination had been made. Yet in hot haste he telegraphs to his friend, Governor Johnston, that he accepts both nomination and platform; and then Governor Johnston—always it is he, and none but him, figuring in the business—rises up to make, in so far as possible, this to be an *official* acceptance of the platform, by reading the whole despatch to the convention, doubtless to be recorded on its journal. And now be it remarked that nobody in the convention rose to make any inquiry as to the *shape* in which the platform had thus been accepted by Gen. Scott, though the convention well knew, on the showing of Governor Johnston himself, that the revenue resolution had been published erroneously, and though the most material and fatal omissions in the Compromise resolution, as published, had been fully pointed out in the public journals. Now, when this hurried telegraphic acceptance of a most important resolution, thus published everywhere in a form which made it nugatory, was made known to the convention, and made a part of its record, did it not plainly present a case for inquiry and explanation? Does the absence of all inquiry or explanation, in such circumstances, look honest? To say nothing of the want of dignity and due decorum in Gen. Scott's hot haste to take the reporter's emasculated platform, does the whole case—so unprecedented in any one of its features—look like fair dealing with the people? Does it give a candidate for the Presidency a fair and manly position at the start? It may be that we shall yet have an acceptance of the official platform by letter, as we now have an acceptance of the very different *unofficial* platform by telegraph. If this be the case, there will have been—of course *altogether accidentally*—not only two platforms, but two acceptances of them, provided *for the stump!*

The Scott organs told us beforehand that the Whig platform, if it imbodied the finality of the Compromise, would be "a gull-trap and a cheat." But they failed to tell us that, in its adoption, publication, and acceptance, it would form *two* separate "gull-traps" and a *double* "cheat!"—*Washington Union June ——.*

### GEN. PIERCE AND ABOLITION.

THAT our readers may know Mr. Pierce's position on the Abolition question, we extract the following from a speech delivered by him in the United States Senate in 1838, on a resolution presented by Mr. Calhoun, to prohibit the reception of petitions on the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. It was about this time that Mr. Fillmore wrote his celebrated Erie Abolition Letter, in which he avowed himself in favour of the *immediate* abolition of Slavery in the District. The position of Gen. Pierce contrasts most favourably with that occupied by Mr. Fillmore at that time:

"Resolved, That the intermeddling of any State or States, or their citizens, to abolish Slavery in this District, or any of the Territories, on the ground, or under the pretext, that it is immoral or sinful, or the passage of any act or measure of Congress with that view, would be a direct and dangerous attack on the institutions of all the slaveholding States."

Mr Pierce, of New Hampshire, rose, and said the Senate had come at length to the ground on which this contest was to be determined. The District of Columbia was now emphatically the battle-field of the Abolitionists, and the resolution immediately under consideration, with, perhaps, some modification in phraseology, would present the true issue here and to the country—an issue which would raise, not a mere question of expediency, but one of much higher character, in which the public faith is directly involved.

That my position, said Mr. Pierce, may be distinctly understood, some explanation is perhaps due to the State which I have the honour, in part, to represent, especially as there is a manifest disposition, in certain quarters, to pervert our votes and misrepresent our motives.

I have given to the resolutions all the consideration which I am capable of bestowing, and have listened to the debate which they have elicited with interest and profound attention.

If the grave objections suggested on the other side were sustained by an examination of the resolutions themselves or a course of sound argumentation, they would ensure my opposition. What are they? The first that reached my ear was, that they contain latent nullification. I have waited to hear the particular resolution, sentence or phrase pointed out, in which this heresy is supposed to be concealed, and I have waited in vain. Having then, assertion on one side, and what appears to me to be the plain reading of the resolutions and the frank and unqualified declarations of the mover on the other, I must be excused if I do not take the alarm.

We have next eloquent disquisitions upon the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press. To every sentiment uttered upon these subjects, I yield my cordial assent; but why introduced on this particular occasion, I have been at a loss to determine. Would any man here abridge the liberty or assail the freedom of the press? I take it not: Is there anything in the resolution to sanction the invasion of either? Not a syllable. That these are privileges most dear to every American is freely admitted by all. Why such a variety of changes have been rung upon them in this debate, others may determine. It is not my province to judge of motives, and I would take occasion only to remark, that no man shall make up an issue upon a subject for me. I oppose the Abolitionists, for the very reason that I entertain a sacred regard for these in common with all other rights secured by the Constitution.

But it is further urged against the resolution (said Mr. Pierce) that they are mere abstractions. Sir, it is quite immaterial what name you apply to them; it is sufficient is it that they meet the case, that they encounter the Abolitionist upon sound and tenable ground, and furnish a conclusive answer to his importunities. To say that the petitions refer only to this District, and that the principles asserted in the preceding resolutions are consequently without application, is idle. It is impossible to read a single number of the leading abolition periodicals, without perceiving that their object reaches far beyond this District, and stops at no point short of emancipation in the States. And yet, sir, I suspect that you would find few intelligent Abolitionists who would assert that Congress has the power to interfere with Slavery in the States; but admitting the want of power here, they hold it their duty, as individuals, to persevere in the cause. Regarding the institution of Slavery as morally wrong, or sinful, if you please, they consider themselves, as citizens, as citizens of the Union, responsible for its continuance, wherever it may exist within our borders. This feeling has its origin, to some extent, in a misapprehension of the structure of our Government, and this error the preceding resolutions are calculated to correct. They assert, in effect, that the citizen of New Hampshire is no more responsible, morally or politically, for the existence and continuance of this domestic institution in Virginia or Maryland, than he would be for the existence of any similar institution in France or Persia. Why? Because these are matters over which the States respectively, when delegating a portion of their powers, to be exercised by the General Government, retained the whole and exclusive control, and for which they are alone responsible.

Now, let these doctrines be universally understood and admitted, and you take one great step towards satisfying the consciences of honest but misguided people, in one section of the country, and quieting the irritation, for which there has been too much cause, in the other. This we have attempted to do. We are bound to go further, and frankly declare to these petitioners that so long as Slavery shall continue in Virginia and Maryland, it is in vain for them to expect its abolition here; that we are forbidden to legislate upon this subject under existing circumstances, by obligations hardly inferior to the Constitution itself; and that Congress cannot abolish Slavery in the District, against the wishes of the inhabitants, without a gross breach of public faith, and an outrageous infraction of private rights.—(*Tallahassee Fla.*) *Floridian and Journal.*

WHENCE SOUTH CAROLINA FIRE EATING EDITORS COME.—We have frequently noticed the queer fact that the most violent fire-eaters of the South—witness John A. Quitman and Pierre Soule—come from, were born and educated in, sections, States or counties, in which Slavery had no existence. Such gentlemen always have the fact of their place and birth spurring them on to out Herod Herod, out Rhett Rhett, and they do their work with a fierce zeal which seems to us exceedingly overdone—altogether too much for our appetite.

We know this fact, and have therefore noted it. We never, however, suspected that the fire-eating editors of South Carolina were imported articles—that the larger number of them came from the North they revile so bitterly, and that there, like Elwood Fisher, the editor of the Washington *Southern Press*, they had spent the chief portion of their lives. But the *Greenville* (*S. C.*) *Patriot*, of the 28th ult., says that such are the facts, and details the particulars as follows:

"But how great must be the astonishment of every one when he ascertains that some of these intensely Carolina editors are Yankees, Irishmen and Englishmen. One of the principal writers under the editorial head of the *Charleston Mercury*, that embodiment of Carolina secession, is a Yankee born and educated, and who came South to seek his fortune—Mr. Clapp. The next secession paper in South Carolina for prominence and ability is the *Carolinian*—edited by a *native* Carolinian, born in Ireland—who has taken a solemn oath of allegiance to the United States. Mr. Johnson is assisted in his editorial labours by a friend from the North—Mr. Cavis. There is another paper in Columbia, now edited we think by a Northern man with Southern principles! The *Charleston Courier*, which came out for disunion last fall, has always been owned in part by a Northern man. There are others which we disdain to mention, who have aliens by birth conducting them, and who are for disunion *per se*.—*N. O. Paper.*

THE RIGHT SPIRIT.—It always affords us considerable gratification to chronicle any instance of a right spirit being entertained to our institutions by our Northern brethren, consequently it is with deep satisfaction that we lay before our readers the subjoined extract from a letter addressed by a House in Boston to the Captain of one of their vessels now in this port. We would that all could be induced to imitate such praiseworthy conduct. "See that you do not bring any negroes—slaves—away. If you find any secreted after you get to sea, no matter if in Boston Bay, we wish you to return to port and deliver any such slaves to their owners or the proper authorities. We would spare neither expense or trouble in restoring to our Southern friends their slaves."—*Charleston Courier.*

HERE ARE THE NAMES.—On the 12th inst., we published an extract from a letter addressed by a House in Boston to the Captain of their vessels now loading at this port for that city, to be careful in not bringing any slaves away, and in the event of his finding any after he had got to sea, no matter if in Boston Bay, to return to port and deliver any such slaves to their owners, or the proper authorities—intimating their desire to spare neither expense or trouble in restoring to their Southern friends their Slaves. The Sumter Black River *Watchman* publishes our paragraph with the subjoined prefatory remarks:

"*Out with the name.*—The *Charleston Courier*, of the 12th inst., contains the following paragraph: We regret that the names of the parties who have acted in so praiseworthy a manner, and with so proper a regard for the rights of Slaveholders, have not been given. Let our commercial community, at all events, be apprised of the parties who have acted so honorably, that they may in future know where to send their orders for goods, when they purchase from a Northern market."

In reply to the above we must, in the first place, state that the letter in question was not written for publication, but was solely intended for the Captain, to whom it was addressed. He, however, in the course of business, had occasion to show the letter to his consignee, who was immediately struck with the noble sentiments emanating from that quarter, and made the extract alluded to, and handed it to us for publication. Under such circumstances we did not feel justified in publishing the names of the parties, although very anxious so to do. But since our Sumter cotemporary is so solicitous in the premises, we now readily state the sentiments he so much approves, proceeded from Messrs. Foster & Taylor, General Merchants, Boston, owners of the Barque *Lady Suffolk*, Capt. Polleys, now loading at this port for Boston, and that they were contained in a business letter to Captain Polleys.—*Ibid.*

THE SIMS ANNIVERSARY.—The anniversary of the rendition of Thomas Sims, the fugitive slave, who was surrendered to his owner and departed for Georgia on the 12th of April, 1851, was observed in Boston by services at the Melodeon. The order of services was as follows: Reading of Scripture by Rev. T. W. Higginson; prayer by Rev. Daniel Foster; singing of an original hymn, composed by Rev. John Pierpont; a discourse by Rev. Theodore Parker; followed by the singing of an original hymn, composed by Mr. Parker; prayer by Rev. Mr. Croswell and benediction. In the afternoon and evening there were public addresses. Among the speakers were Francis Jackson, Charles Remond, Wendell Phillips, Wm. L. Garrison. Mr. Webster, as usual, was visited with a round of those bad expressions which the delirious orators of the Abolition forum know so well how to utter. Mr. Phillips made an estimate of the amount of sum and substance, of the Anti-Slavery sentiment prevailing at this time in Massachusetts. He said there was just enough to make certain men behave themselves—to make the Legislature pass resolutions which meant nothing—to get Sumner into the Senate and abide his silence there—to get Rantoul into the House of Representatives and observe his attempt to lie himself out of his position—but this was not enough. This would not be sufficient to save the Commonwealth; so he concluded by abandoning his peace doctrines, and intimating that fugitive slaves must hereafter rely upon their own right arms. He eulogised the courage which undertook and executed the slaughter of Mr. Gorsuch at Christiana; and said the people there would not arouse until Marshal Tukey's life ended in a singular tragedy.—*Mobile Daily Register.*

MEANING OF TERMS ON RED RIVER.—On Red river (and also in many parts of Texas and the upper parishes of Louisiana), a different understanding of terms prevails to that obtaining in many of the older States. For instance, on Red river, and parts adjacent, the following, according to the exemplifications, are correct definitions:

PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION—Drinking, horse-swapping, horse-racing, cock-fighting, and gambling.

PRINCIPAL PRODUCTION—Blacklegs, congestive fever, topers, horse-thieves, and fever and ague.

LAW—Pistols, Bowie-knives, and double-barrelled shot-guns.

EQUITY—Assassination, for private injuries; for public—whipping, tar and feathers, rail-riding, and expeditious hanging, without benefit of clergy.

OFFICERS OF JUSTICE—All owners of deadly weapons.

SOCIAL DUTIES—To steal your neighbour's corn and other "fixins," if he have any, and then assist him to kill another neighbour for the theft.—*Camden* (*Ala.*) *Southern Republic.*

## Selections.

### THE SEAT OF JUSTICE DISHONOURED.

THE communication below from Bro. McBride, one of our most worthy ministers, will explain to the reader the manner in which the Virginians receive, entertain, or possess, the spirit of Slavery. The resolutions quoted were published in the Southern papers, but have not before reached the Northern public eye. He is one of the expelled.—ED.

MR. EDITOR: Some months ago, the true-hearted friends of Slavery, after expelling Rev. J. C. Bacon—driving Jonathan Roberts and other good and respectable citizens from their homes, in the county of Grayson, Virginia, tied John Cornett to a tree, and whipped him most severely on his bare back, simply because he entertained Anti-Slavery sentiments—designed to free his slaves and give to them his property. Mr. Cornett subsequently appealed to the law for redress. At the time of the Court when the lynchers were to be tried for their abuse of Cornett, they again rallied their forces—equipped and armed, and marched round the court house—fired volleys, and then went in and fired volleys—dispersed the court—took possession of the house—organized by appointing the Sheriff chairman, and then adopted the following resolutions:

ALL LAW ABROGATED.

1st. Resolved, That the Committee of Vigilance heretofore formed be recognised by the chairman of this meeting, and their numbers increased to two hundred each, and that the said committees report to a general meeting to be held at the Court House, on the 4th Monday in June next, the number and names of all Abolitionists yet remaining in the country.

2d. Resolved, The notice be given by said committee to John Cornett, and all others defiled with Abolitionism, that unless they give positive assurance to live with us as become citizens of a slave-holding community, they will be permitted to remain in this country no longer than may be necessary to sell their property, and close their business.

3d. Resolved, That the Clerks of our county and circuit courts shall not be permitted to issue any writ or writs from their respective offices upon any memorandum made or sent by any persons, for the commencement of any suit or suits against citizens of this county for any act done by them, having for its object the expulsion of Abolitionists from the county; or to prevent further dissemination of the abolition doctrines among us, if issued, that the Sheriff of this county shall not execute any such process upon such citizens for the cause aforesaid.

4th. Resolved, That we will hold the said Clerks and Sheriffs personally responsible for a violation of the preceding resolutions; and for a compliance therewith, we pledge ourselves to stand between them and all danger, whether personal or pecuniary.

5th. Resolved, That we know what we say and mean to do as we say; and that so far as it may depend upon the action of the people of Grayson County, no Abolitionist shall contaminate our atmosphere with his pestiferous breath, or be permitted to pollute the soil of the State with his foot.

6th. Resolved, That the thanks of the people of Grayson County are especially due, and the same are hereby tendered, to their brethren of Wythe County, for their kind sympathy, and their resolutions to aid us in resisting any and all attempts to harrass our citizens with law suits, for applying the only efficient remedy to incorrigible Abolitionists.

7th. Resolved, That while we have no wish to be personal, nor threaten violence to any one, we cannot but regard the act of instituting a suit against our citizens for what they have done as encouragement to the few disciples of the infamous Bacon yet remaining amongst us—as fraught with danger to ourselves and our neighbours of the adjoining counties, and as demanding at our hands this public expression of our just indignation and of our fixed purpose to protect ourselves and property—peaceably if we can—forcibly if we must.

On motion of Col. Stephen Hale, the following resolutions were adopted:

8th. Resolved, That if Messrs. Jas. W. Sheffey and B. W. Wysor should visit Grayson County for the purpose of instituting or carrying on a suit or suits of John Cornett, or any other of the like character, we think they should be treated to a coat of tar and feathers; and we will aid in bestowing the same.

9th. Resolved, That neither Geo. W. Reeves, Stephen M. Dickey, tavern-keepers, at the court house, nor any other citizen of the county, shall receive as guests into their taverns or houses, Jas. W. Sheffey, Benjamin F. Wysor, or any other person who shall come for the pupose of propagating abolition principles, or aiding them in any manner, shape, or form.

On motion of G. H. Mathews, it was

10th. Resolved, That all candidates for office in the gift of the people of this county be required to endorse these resolutions, and that they agree, in writing, to strike from the polls, votes of all known Abolitionists, and not count them in ascertaining the result of the elections.

11th. Resolved, That these proceedings be published in the *Wytheville Republican*, the Abingdon papers, and that the papers throughout the State be requested to copy.

On motion, this meeting now adjourned.

JAMES DICKY, Chairman.

WILEY D. HALE, Secretary.

The North will see from these resolutions what slaveholders are ready to do. After driving that good man, James C. Bacon, from their midst, giving him his choice between bight and death—breaking up the Wesleyan meetings; tearing down their places of worship; whipping, taring and feathering; abusing and literally driving from their own homes all who entertain the opinion that Slavery is incompatible with Christianity; these "law-loving and law-abiding" slaveholders defy the arm of the civil law to touch them for their *lower-law* proceedings.

Let the people of the North read and understand, that tavern-keepers dare not entertain boarders; that lawyers dare not plead a case; that courts dare not sit, and that clerks of county courts dare not "issue a writ," and that Sheriffs dare not conform to their oaths, and excute the duties of their office, only at the dictation of *slaveholders!*

But perhaps the reader is ready to say, Was not this mob composed of the rabble? It was composed of lawyers and other sworn officers. Stephen Hale, the father of the 8th resolution, is a Methodist class leader. But let no one be discouraged. Villainous despotisms like this will create a re-action; bold and good men will not submit: will oppose such outrages: will be waked up and called into the field of active opposition to oppression, by such atrocities, such dastardly conduct. These wrongs are only steps, therefore, necessary to the downfall of the institution itself.

By what I have been told, I should think, nearly one hundred families have left Grayson County since Bro. Bacon's expulsion. Six hundred families have moved from North Carolina, on account of Slavery, since Bro. Crooks and the writer were expelled. Think you, Mr. Editor, these (us) fugitives will, in any way, voluntarily support Slavery! I tell you nay. Yours, J. MCBRIDE.

River Styx, P. O. Medina Co., O., June 11, 1852.
—*True Wesleyan.*

### *THE BALTIMORE WHIG CONVENTION.*

WHILE we cheerfully recognise our duty to sustain the nominee of the Whig National Convention, it is equally our duty, briefly to place on record why it is that General Scott and not Daniel Webster received the nomination of that body.

The testimony of an opponent, when favourable, is always of more weight than that of a friend; and therefore, we quote the telegraphic dispatch of a *quasi* member of the Convention, Henry J. Raymond, to the *New York Times*. That paper of Saturday contained the following, which Mr. Raymond on the floor of the Convention, admitted that he had written:

"BALTIMORE, Friday, June 18.

"Six ballots show an average strength of WEBSTER, 29; FILLMORE, 130; SCOTT, 133. To-morrow, it is believed, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and one or two others will give SCOTT the nomination on the third or fourth ballot. *The Northern Whigs gave way on the platform with this understanding.* IF SCOTT IS NOT NOMINATED, THEY WILL CHARGE BREACH OF FAITH ON THE SOUTH.

* * * * * *

"The New York delegation are very indignant at the summary ejection of the New York Scott men, and if Scott is defeated by it, they will protest against the action of the Convention, and disavow its binding force."

It is quite true that this was declared to be a base, unmitigated falsehood; and it is equally true, that its author, Mr. Raymond, conceded that he had written what was false. But circumstances speak in a language which admits of no misapprehension; and the subsequent conduct of a portion of the delegations from Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, leaves no doubt but that Mr. Raymond, for the purpose of apologizing for the Whigs of the North acceeding to a National Platform, foolishly and weakly exposed the "bargain and corruption" through which Mr. Webster was to be defeated. His language admits of no misconstruction—no doubt. He says—"*Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia*, and one or two others, will give Scott the nomination on the third or fourth ballot." And these identical States, did give it him on the sixth ballot on Saturday. And then to account for their doing so and to excuse the Scott Whigs for yielding to the Compromise, he adds:—"*The Northern Whigs gave way on the platform with* THIS UNDERSTANDING!" and fearful of a non-fulfilment of their part of the contract, he makes proclamation, that "if Scott *is* BREACH OF FAITH they (the Northern Whigs) *will charge*

We ask any honest man to read the paragraph consecutively as we quote it from the *Times*, and it is absolutely impossible to deny that it is as full and explicit an exposition of the *conditions* of a corrupt *bargain* as ever was placed on paper. True, it was indignantly repudiated as an unmitigated falsehood by the parties concerned; and it is equally true, that its author preferring to be branded as a calumniator to conceding that he had been so *indiscreet* as to expose the schemes of friends, boldly and shamelessly *admitted* that it *was false*. But this in no wise alters the fact, that the bargain was made and consummated; and that by such a dishonest and disgraceful proceeding, the nomination of Daniel Webster was defeated.

We might pause here, and after having exposed, by the testimony of those opposed to us, the cause of our defeat, decline all further reference to the late Convention. But we prefer a different course. We prefer to admit the people to peep behind the scenes, and to let them know what was done to arrest the threatened evil.

We discovered at an early period of the canvass, that a sufficient number of the Southern Delegations were only waiting for a favourable opportunity to dispose of the principles of the Compromise and the Northern Whigs who had sustained it, to the Abolition and Free Soil parties of the North, on the plea of *expediency*.—And the gallant and chivalric Whigs of Maryland, Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, &c. &c., gave us notice, that portions of the Delegations from Tennessee, Virginia, and Kentucky, and probably North Carolina, were ready, upon the slightest pretext, to cast ther ballots for Scott, without the least regard to the abandonment of principles involved in such a proceeding and its great injustice to the Conservative Whigs of the North. This was indeed, astounding intelligence to the Conservatives of the Whig party from the North; and with one accord, we appealed to the South not to involve us in any such dishonour. We said to them plainly and emphatically—"if you choose to abandon your principles and the principles of the Compromise, on the miserable plea of political *expediency* or to gratify your personal attachments, do so; but in the name of all that is sacred, sell not your Northern friends to the Abolitionists and fanatics of the North. And mark us—if you do so sell both us and your principles—if you do thus intend to transfer us to the abolition ranks, and to heap dishonour upon our heads—we are not to be purchased back at your pleasure, again to fight your battles for you, only to be again cast aside as a worn out glove or a worthless garment, which, having served its purpose, is no longer worthy of preservation." We pointed out to them the consequences of their suicidal course; and warned them against it, and we pointed to the abuse and contumely which we of the North had fearlessly incurred in their cause, and in defence of their constitutional rights; and demanded of them as honorable men, not to sacrifice us to *Abolitionism* on the miserable plea of *expediency*. We cheerfully admitted the many virtues, and great services of General Scott—his umblemished private character, his patriotism, and his respect for the constitutional rights of every section of the Union.—But we insisted that as the candidate of the Abolition and Free Soil factions, who had refused to give his adhesion to the Fugitive Slave Law, and accepted the support of a State Convention which advocated its repeal—his nomination, however great our respect for him, was an act of ingratitude to the whole Conservative North, an insult to its devotion to the Constitution—and an attempt, to the extent of their ability, to disgrace and dishonour those who had stood by them in the hour of danger, and perilled everything for the preservation of their constitutional rights and the Union of the States.

But we appealed in vain, and talked to men who had determined to shut their ears to the demands of justice and the requirements of honour. We then pointed to DANIEL WEBSTER as the great defender of the Constitution—the man who, on the 7th of March, 1850, had staked everything upon that very Compromise which saved to all of us the Union of the States, and to the South, not only their constitutional rights, but the blessings of Peace and safety—the blessing of laying their heads upon their pillows at night without the fear of being roused ere the dawn of day by the cry of servile insurrection, or of daily, nightly, hourly apprehensions of the torch and the knife in the hands of a servile race, excited to mischief by fanatics and madmen far more censurable in the eye of Heaven than the all but *Brutes* they would incite to the murder of their masters. We pointed to DANIEL WEBSTER as emphatically the father of the Compromise—the man who took it upon his shoulders as a part and parcel of that constitution, to the defence of which his whole life has been devoted, as the man who by the power of his mighty intellect, the force of his personal character, and the influence of his great name and a life spent in the service of his country—had created for it a public opinion in the North which not only rendered it acceptable to the great mass of the Northern people, but insured obedience to its requirements through all future time. We urged upon them the great services of DANIEL WEBSTER as well to the Whig party as to the country at large, and his claims to their gratiutde not only as representatives of the slave-holding States, but as Whigs. We appealed to their patriotism as well as to their justice, their *promises* in the hour of danger, and their gratitude; and we entreated of them to reflect upon the honour which would be conferred upon the whole country and the benefits which would incur to the cause of Republican institutions throughout the world, from elevating to the chief magistracy one who is, by universal consent, the first intellect of the age in which we live.

But our appeals fell upon ears closed to the best instincts of our nature. "*Expediency*" was the reckless cry; and in answer to all we could urge against the transfer of the whole North into the arms of Abolition and the dishonour of such transfer, we were pointed to the *Platform* of the Convention as the specific against such a result. We responded that no sooner could Gen. SCOTT be placed upon that Platform, than his Abolition friends would *kick* it from under him and laugh to scorn the conservative Whigs of the North and the South who sought thus to control the fanaticism of the day. This, too, they pretended to disbelieve. But it is only a *pretence*. They know that we, one and all, spoke the truth in this regard as in all others; and RAYMOND'S telegraphic dispatch gave them the evidence of its truth even before they consummated their bargain with our Abolition opponents. Now mark the consequence. On the very day after the Convention nominates General SCOTT, and that, too, by the very votes which RAYMOND asserted were *bargained* for by *pretending* to accept the platform, the *Tribune* held the following language in relation to it:

"WE DEFY IT, EXECRATE IT, SPIT UPON IT."

There, Messrs. Delegates from Virginia, what say you now for your Platform and the candidate you dragged upon it? The *Tribune* glories in your nomination of General SCOTT and says he *shall* be elected; but in the same paper it tells you, that it *defies, execrates*, and SPITS upon your platform.

The honest and honourable men of the South, deeply lamented the treason which existed in their own ranks, and did not conceal it from their Northern friends. They would willingly have united with the friends of Mr. WEBSTER, to give the nomination to that truly great Patriot; but they assured us that any such attempt would be seized upon to consummate the meditated treason to the Compromise. In like manner, it was apprehended, that any movement to unite upon Mr. Fillmore in order to secure defeat with our principles in preference to defeat and an alliance with Abolitionism, would produce a similar result. It was desirable therefore, to stand by our respective candidates, in the hope and in the *assurance* that while we did so, the bargain proclaimed by Raymond would not be consummated, because the Delegates from *Tennessee, Virginia* and *Kentucky*, known to be anxious to go over to the candidate of the Abolitionists, would not dare to carry their purpose into effect and return to meet the condemnation of their insulted and misrepresented constituents. In that event, the Convention, when tired of balloting, would have adjourned *sine die* and called upon the People to elect delegates to a National Convention to assemble at Cincinnati on the second Monday in September. A resolution to this effect was actually drawn and in possession of a distinguished delegate from Louisiana; and probably the knowledge of this fact, and the certainty that a Convention fresh from the people, would promptly nominate Mr. Webster, compelled the factions alluded to by Raymond, to break from their colleagues and secure the nomination of their favourite, even at the hazard of political ostracism forever hereafter, by their outraged constituents.

The result is before the Public. Daniel Webster, who has now lived his three-score years and ten—nearly fifty of which have been devoted to the cause of his country, her Constitution, and the preservation of the *Union* which that Constitution creates and perpetuates; Daniel Webster, the soundest Lawyer, the most accomplished Scholar, the truest Whig, the staunchest Patriot, the most brilliant Orator, the ripest Statesman and the greatest intellect of the age; has been thrust aside now and forever, by an ungrateful party and in the gratification of an *iniquitous* bargain, to give place to a candidate whose nomination was demanded by the Abolitionists of the North and all their Free Soil allies who demand the repeal of the Compromise; and who, to effect it, threaten a renewal of agitation on the question of *Slavery!*

Do not let us be misunderstood. We would not willingly pluck one leaf from the chaplet of honour which adorns the brow of the Hero of Mexico, and which he has so nobly won. We doubt not his devotion to the Constitution, and we readily concede the magnitude and brilliancy of his military achievements, and the purity of his private character. He is a great, gallant, and magnanimous soldier, and worthy of the gratitude of every true-hearted American. But he is immensely behind Daniel Webster in qualifications for the Presidency; and what is of even still more importance to those who have dared to do battle for the Compromise and the Constitution in the hour of peril, he is the chosen candidate of those very men against whom we of the North and South waged battle, and who, by their wild fanaticism and reckless agitation of the Slavery question, brought this mighty Union to the very brink of destruction. We fought not against the nomination of Gen. Scott *per se*; but we did use all honourable means to defeat the candidate of the Abolition party, war against them—to secure an act of simple justice to our great Whig leader—and to insure the triumph of our party and our principles in the approaching struggle with the great Democratic Party of the Union, no longer divided and rent assunder by internal strife, but united in one solid body by the sacrifice of all *principle* upon the altar of *expediency* and fighting under their own consecrated war cry, that "*to the victor belong the spoils.*" In these efforts, prosecuted with all the zeal that the strongest convictions of duty could inspire, we have been unsuccessful; and now, without any other feeling than respect for the nominee of the Whig National Convention, we are ready to go into the coming canvass however hopeless we may consider it, and however sore may be the bleeding wounds inflicted upon the conservative Whigs of the nation, by the reckless and ungrateful conduct of the very men in whose behalf they have heretofore so cheerfully incurred every conceivable odium and abuse.

But in thus giving in our adherence to the action of the Whig National Convention, we pledge ourselves to the support of its candidate, because we most cheerfully sustain the Platform of principles upon which he is placed. We take the candidate and the platform together, one and indivisible; and will sustain them both in good faith, so long as they are thus sustained by the Whig party. But if the Whigs of this State thrust aside the Platform, and sustain the candidate only, we may feel it incumbent upon us to abandon the candidate and adhere to the Platform. We are willing to be bound by the action of the Convention; but we are not willing that our candidate shall be supported by us because of the Platform upon which he is placed, while the great mass of our brother Whigs repudiate that Platform altogether, and assume that their candidate will not be bound by it if elected.

We feel that success cannot crown our labours; but we shall labour honestly notwithstanding, in the Whig cause, while it continues to be such, in the consciousness that we are dischrrging a duty, and that we all have the sympathy of that gallant portion of the South who have never courted dishonour, and who stand ready to punish, as they merit, the time-serving, expediency-loving, and *bargaining* politicians in their midst, who have dishonoured themselves, our country, and the cause of Republicanism throughout the world, by withholding from Daniel Webster the Presidency of the United States. But, thank God, however severely they have stricken their friends at the North, and withheld from the Nation its noblest triumph, they have not been able to injure *him* through whom they have wounded their country. Daniel Webster has reared for himself a fame and a name as imperishable as the Granite hills of the State of his nativity; and when the names of those who have aimed at him this blow, are as little known as is the identity of the gnat which inflicts its puny bite upon the noble stag as he roams proudly through the forest—and when even the name of the city, in which they accomplished their unholy purpose, has ceased to be remembered by the generations which are to follow—when its monuments shall have crumbled into dust, and even their localities be forgotten, the name of Daniel Webster will be lisped by the young and remembered by the aged, as the great defender of that *Constitution* and that *Union*, which are the priceless legacies of Washington and his compeers.—*N. Y. Courier and Enquirer.*

A FUGITIVE SLAVE CASE.—A very remarkable instance of the pursuit of a fugitive slave has just occurred in this city, the particulars of which have not been made public, because the peculiarities of the case prevented the pursuit of the fugitive from taking the customary course. But we can vouch for the truth of the statement we are about to make, as it came from an interested party, and one of great respectability.

A few weeks since a Southern gentleman arrived in the city, and made known to a confidential friend that he had come in pursuit of a runaway slave, his own property, and from the fact of the slave being a beautiful young woman, and nearly white, he thought it advisable not to attempt to recover her by making application in any quarter where the fact of his pursuit would be likely to be made known to the public, as his object might thereby be frustrated. His friend advised him, therefore, to offer a reward of two thousand dollars, to some intelligent police officer, for the arrest of the fugitive, and trust to his prudence and discretion. The advice was taken, and after a while a clue was got to the whereabouts of the beautiful fugitive, but before she could be arrested she was "up and gone, the graceless girl," and away down east, where the sun rises, and beyond the reach of her legal proprietor.

There was nothing unusual or marvelous in all this, but it was discovered during the time that the search for the fugitive was being made, that the "fair she" was not only the legal property of the pursuer, but his natural property also; she was, in fact, his own daughter, and had escaped from the man to whom her father and owner had hired her. Since her arrival in this city she had captivated the heart of a white gentleman, who did not suspect her origin, and been "woo'd and wedded and a';" and her husband, having by some means or other got scent of the danger, instead of playing the part of Inkle to his Yarico, had the manliness to bear her off to a place of safety.

These are the essential facts of this fugitive slave case, which are sufficiently romantic and strange to be the figment of a lively imagination. But that fact is stranger than fiction has become a truism, and nothing is now disbelieved on account of its strangeness.—*New York Sunday Courier.*

# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

††† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1852.

## Freedom's Grand and True Celebration of Independence Day.

THE Board of Managers of the Massachusetts A. S. Society announce to the unwearied friends of the millions yet groaning in bondage on the American Soil, that the FOURTH OF JULY will be consecrated by the Society, as hitherto, by a MASS CELEBRATION in the beautiful Grove at Abington, at which their presence, from the various sections of the State, is strongly solicited—the day and the occasion being most appropriately theirs, to be used efficiently for the advent of that glorious day when 'liberty shall be proclaimed throughout ALL the land, unto ALL the inhabitants thereof.'

☞As the 4th of July, this year, occurs on Sunday, the celebration will take place on MONDAY, the 5th.

☞A special train of cars will leave the Old Colony Railroad Depot, Boston, at half-past 9 o'clock, A. M., precisely. This will allow ample time for our friends in Essex, Middlesex and Worcester counties to reach the city by the earliest trains, in season for the excursion. Returning, the train from Abington will leave so as to arrive in Boston as early as 7, P. M.

☞Among the speakers expected to be present on the occasion, are Wendell Phillips, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Edmund Quincy, Parker Pillsbury, Stephen S. Foster, Abby K. Foster, Miss Sallie Hollie (of Rochester, N. Y.), Charles L. Remond, and Nathaniel H. Whiting.

☞Should the weather prove unpropitious for assembling in the Grove, the meetings will be held in the Town Hall, immediately adjacent to the Grove.

☞The fare, by special train, will be *half price*; but, to ensure this, one hundred passengers are necessary. As many as intend going from Boston and the vicinity, are requested to leave their names at the Anti-Slavery Office, 21 Cornhill, seasonably. The half fare arrangement will extend to passengers from both ends of the road, and to those coming by the South Shore railroad.

The following gentlemen have been appointed, by the Board, the Committee of Arrangements for the celebration: Francis Jackson, Samuel May, Jr., Lewis Ford, Thomas J. Hunt, Briggs Arnold, Elbridge Sprague, Philander Shaw, Samuel Dyer, M. H. Pool, Bourne Spooner, Nathaniel B. Spooner.

EDMUND QUINCY, Sec. FRANCIS JACKSON, Pres.

HOW MR. WEBSTER lost the nomination in the Baltimore Convention has been the topic of the week, and, after various surmises and assertions, backed up by arguments and developments as various, has at length come to be settled on a plain and cognizable basis. The milk in the cocoa-nut was satisfactorily accounted for, for a day or two, by a correspondent of the *Boston Courier*, said to be Mr. Choate, who attributed the defeat of his great file-leader to a want of votes. It occurred to somebody, however, before Saturday night, to ask why the votes were wanting? which left the matter pretty much where it was before any question was raised. Mr. Choate, moreover, had left an impression upon the public mind that a dim glimmering of a North was perceptible at Baltimore, and that although the Northern delegates were ready to yield what they hitherto, for want of some other name, had called their principles, and had also permitted the South to build a platform to her own liking, yet they utterly refused to give her beside the nomination. Such a Compromise, it was thought, ought to be satisfactory, and the appeal of Mr. Choate, and his friends, to certain Northern members, though made "almost with tears," as he himself says, was utterly disregarded. These obdurate and hard-hearted persons were determined to have their man, and insisted that the South should be satisfied with her share—the Platform.

Such a representation, of course, excited a storm of indignation among Mr. Webster's friends, which is greatly aggravated by the course of the *Tribune*, and other factious sheets, which, having secured the Man, declare now that they will have nothing to do with the Platform. What difference it will make whether they will or not, we confess we do not see, if they succeed in electing Gen. Scott, who avows his determination that he and his Administration shall be based thereon. It is not so much what individual Whigs may *say*, but what the party will *do*, that is the important point; and if Mr. Greeley will help put the party where it can catch her runaways, the South, we take it, will care very little if he should reach his office by a bye-street when there happens to be a slave-hunt in Broadway. The only wonder is that any of his Whig contemporaries, should complain of Mr. Greeley. He means to do the work marked out by the Platform, in the election; if, at the same time, by declaring he is engaged in very execrable business, he can get some Free Soilers to help him do it, is it not all grist to the Whig mill? They should thank him, and not abuse him, for he does far more than they. It is not given to all editors to stultify themselves for the sake of the party.

But how the matter stands at present on Mr. Webster's want of a nomination, the reader may see by turning to an article in another column, from the *Courier and Enquirer*. It was said of one John Lilburn, in Cromwell's time, that he 'could not live without a quarrel; who, if he were left alone in the world, would have to divide himself in two, and set the John to fight with Lilburn, and the Lilburn with John!' Mr. Webb tried hard, in the Convention, but without much success, to get up a quarrel with Mr. Raymond, because he said in a dispatch what Mr. Webb now asserts in an article. How it fares in the present fight between James Watson, on the one hand, and Webb, on the other, it is entertaining and instructive to see. And it will also be seen that Mr. Choate's discovery of a supposed North was, if Col. Webb be right, a mistake of the telescope.

P. S.—When the above was written, the letter of our Boston Correspondent had not reached us. We refer to that also as an able discussion of this interesting question. He goes by faith, and Col. Webb by sight, but both, it will be seen, have come to the same conclusion.

GENERAL PIERCE'S ACCEPTANCE.—Below we give the letter of General Pierce, to the Committee charged with the duty of acquainting him with his nomination for the Presidency, by the Baltimore Democratic Convention. He not only accepts the nomination, but the Platform also, though this, he says, is not expected of him. Whether he means that it was not expected because it would be taken for granted, or whether he does not choose that it shall be left to be implied, that all men may know what they support in supporting him, is not explained. At any rate, the *Evening Post tucks* it away as much out of sight as possible, and says nothing about it; and all other Free Soil papers that have run up, or mean to run up, the Pierce flag will, if they are cunning, make a similar disposition of the letter.

CONCORD, N. H., June 17, 1852.

GENTLEMEN—I have the honour to acknowledge your personal kindness in presenting to me this day your letter officially informing me of my nomination, by the Democratic National Convention, as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States

The surprise with which I received the intelligence of the nomination was not unmingled with painful solicitude, and yet it is proper for me to say that the manner in which it was conferred was peculiarly gratifying. The delegation from New Hampshire, with all the glow of State pride and all the warmth of personal regard, would not have submitted my name to the convention, nor would they have cast a vote for me, under circumstances other than those which occurred

I shall always cherish with pride and gratitude the recollection of the fact that the voice which first pronounced for me—and pronounced alone—came from the mother of States—a pride and gratitude rising far above any consequences that can betide me personally.

May I not regard it as a fact pointing to the overthrow of sectional jealousies, and looking to the perennial life and vigour of a Union cemented by the blood of those who have passed to their reward—a Union wonderful in its formation, boundless in its hopes, amazing in its destiny. I accept the nomination, relying upon an abiding devotion to the interests, the honour, and the glory of our whole country, but, beyond, and above all, upon a Power superior to all human right—a Power which, from the first gun of the revolution, every crisis through which we have passed, in every hour of our acknowledge peril, when the dark clouds have shut down around us, has interposed, as if to baffle human wisdom, outmarch forecast, and bring out of darkness the rainbow of promise. Weak myself, faith and hope repose there in security. I accept the nomination upon the platform adopted by the Convention, not because this is expected of me as a candidate, but because the principles it embraces command the approbation of my judgment; and with them I believe I can safely say there has been no word nor act of my life in conflict.

I have only to tender my grateful acknowledgments to you gentlemen, to the convention of which you were members, and to the people of our common country.

I am with the highest respect, your most obedient servant, FRANK PIERCE.

To Hon J. S. Barbour, J. Thompson, Alpheus Felch, Pierre Soule.

### *THE MARLBOROUGH AFFAIR.*

THE *Pennsylvania Freeman* of Saturday last contains a statement, from the editor, of the final close of the affair at Marlborough, in which he was made so active a participant, and the head and front of offence. The account agrees with that in the *Standard* of last week, without giving all the details of evidence which we copied from a West Chester paper. Of that evidence Mr. Johnson gives this succinct summing-up, which is the clearest statement of the merits of the case that can be made; namely:

1. That Oliver Johnson was a member of the Society of Friends, and therefore that he had a perfect right to speak in its meetings.

2. That, even if he had not been a member, his conduct would have been a violation of no rule or usage of the Society; he having simply risen and begun to speak in an orderly and serious manner on the subject appropriate to the occasion.

3. That there was no rule of discipline conferring upon the Elders or any other individuals authority to stop him, still less to cause him to be removed from the house.

4. That the proceedings of Humphrey Marshall and those associated with him were entirely contrary to the usage of the Society of Friends and a violation of its professed principles, and that those proceedings constituted in themselves a disturbance of the meeting.

5. That the Marlbough meeting is composed of two parties, each claiming an equal right to membership; that those parties were divided on the subject of Anti-Slavery and other Reforms; and that the party opposed to Reform had been engaged in the very mean business of disowning those who differed from them in opinion.

6. That the parties on trial had acted in good faith as members of the Society, not to create but to suppress disturbance; that they had only, in a respectful and Christian manner, protested against what they felt to be contrary to the principles of Friends, and entreated those who had resorted to violence and persecution to forbear.

It will thus be seen, that in this affair the parties are a certain portion of Marlborough Friends on the one side and the universally acknowledegd principles of Friends on the other. If reported in the books, it should stand recorded, Marlborough Friends *versus* Quakeri-m. No doubt these people honestly consider themselves Friends—esteem themselves the "true vine;" for do they not wear coats with but one row of buttons, instead of two, and a standing instead of a rolling collar? And are not their hats of the canonical width of rim, even to the sixteenth of an inch? And do they not say always thee and thou, and never Sir, or Madam—always farewell, and never good bye? And if this is all of Quakerism, truly they are right; "they *are* the people, and wisdom will die with them," or die when the Quaker hat or coat shall no longer be a visible thing on the earth, except the first on the heads of Catholic priests, and the last in her Majesty's drawing room. Nevertheless, there is another view of the matter, however honest these people may be in theirs. George Fox did not come into the world on a Mission of Garments. Whatever he had to say on that matter, he would no doubt say over again in Marlborough Meeting, could he go there, at the risk of a fine of $5; and those leather breeches of his would be held as scandalous to the good order of Society, and as much a mark of obloquy in 'Squire Fleming's Justice's Court, as Oliver Johnson's summer coat of a worldly cut, and of the worldly price of six dollars. Quakerism was something more than 'old clo's' in George Fox's time, whatever Marlborough Meeting, or even Philadelphia or New York Yearly Meeting, may think of it.

In giving the results of the trial last week we expressed a doubt whether the fines of the Friends on trial were paid by their friends or by their opponents. This matter the *Freeman* explains. "I have been assured," says Mr. Johnson, "upon authority which leaves no room for doubt, that *the money was raised by the prosecuting party in the Monthly Meeting*, who were generally too much ashamed of what they had done to show themselves at the time appointed for rendering judgment. There is some reason to suspect that there was an understanding beforehand between the Justice and the prosecutors, through their counsel, as to the amount of the fines, and that the penalty was made as light as possible in mercy to *their pockets!* they having come to the conclusion to bear the pecuniary consequences of their folly rather than incur the indignation of the public by sending their peaceable neighbours to jail."

But as "the blood of the martyrs" is always good seed, so even this small planting of Marlborough Meeting promises a crop. Israel has been again troubled, as we learn from this account in the last *Freeman*:

ANOTHER SCENE AT MARLBOROUGH.

We have, in a letter from a friend, the following account of a scene that occurred on First day in Friends' meeting at Marlborough.

The venerable James Meredith sat at the head of the meeting, while on the same bench sat Amos Preston, a well known minister and member of New Garden Monthly Meeting, Eusebius Barnard, Jonathan Lamborne, J. A. Dugdale, and William Barnard. Amos Preston, after a brief silence, delivered an impressive sermon on the life and mission of Christ, showing with distinctive clearness that those who profess to honour him and hate their brethren are liars and the truth is not in them.

A man then arose in the back part of the house—a stranger to all present (his name, it afterwards appeared, was Charles Stearns)—and commenced speaking in a calm and serious manner. He said he had heard of the people called Friends and was prepared to receive their doctrine of the inward light; that he was once in a course of preparation for the ministry, when a circumstance occurred—Here Humphrey Marshall interrupted him and commanded him to take his seat. He remained standing and asked, "Is this the usage of the Society?" H. Marshall answered, "Yes, it is; I want thee to sit down or go out of the house." Several others united with H Marshall and requested the stranger to sit down; among them Benjamin Parker, James Gawthrop, James T. House, and Isaac H. Bailey.

Vincent Barnard said, "The person is a stranger to me. It is not according to the principles of our Society to stop persons in this way; I hope he will proceed and finish his remarks."

The stranger continued his remarks by saying that he had come to that meeting from a serious impression of duty—not at the instigation of any one. He then went on to speak of the impression made on his mind when a student and while praying in the woods, of the corruption of a hireling priesthood and of the necessity of depending upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit alone. He was interrupted again, when Ruth Dugdale said, "The brother is a stranger to me. There is a part of the meeting who would be willing to hear thee, if thee can wait patiently until those opposed to hearing thee shall retire." She added, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty."

The stranger, however, went on to contrast their conduct with that of George Fox, Robert Barclay, and others who were led by the spirit of God. If, said he, the spirit of George Fox was to arise among you, while you are attempting to silence one who comes to you under an impression of duty, he would pronounce you a set of arrant hypocrites.

William Barnard then spoke of the usages of the Society in a feeling manner, and was followed by Amos Preston, who said he supposed the legality of *his* membership would not be questioned. He proceeded to give a lucid exposition of the principles of the early Quakers, who invited all free people to come and partake with them of the water of life.

Pusey Cloud, a member of Marlborough meeting, and unaccustomed to speaking in meetings for worship, then arose and made an earnest appeal to those who were proving false to their profession, and desired them to contrast their every day walk in life with the principles they professed to love.

Vincent Barnard added a few words, when Lewis Marshall, son of Humphrey Marshall, a young man of unimpeachable integrity, said in an impressive manner that those who rejected the truth on account of the source whence it comes, despised the truth. To see such a spirit exhibited here is lamentable. There was nothing in the message of the stranger to hurt any one. I have felt best satisfied to say thus much, let the consequences be what they may.

The notorious John Huey then repeated the words of Jesus, "I came not to send peace on earth but a sword."

[It might have been very pertinently asked whether the 'sword' in Christ's days, and to which he alluded in the text, was wielded by him and his disciples, or by those who rejected his teachings. The answer to that question would perhaps have thrown some light upon the relative position of parties in the meeting.—*Ed.*] He was evidently under the impression, that the sword was the fit weapon not of the enemies but of the friends of the Church—the only weapon in fact by which it could be saved: and from the spirit he exhibited it would naturally be inferred that he stood ready to gird himself for the battle and do his share of the fighting! Rather a queer sort of Quakerism this!

Humphrey Marshall and Benj. Parker closed *their* meeting, and simultaneously with them James Meredith and Amos Preston shook hands; but the stranger desiring to speak further, a portion of the meeting remained until he had relieved his mind. It is said that he stopped to shake hands with no one, and being followed by one who opposed him and interrogated as to his name, he declined all conversation and passed on, no one knew where.

Legal persecution of the friends of the slave does not seem to have relieved the Marlborough meeting from its difficulties, but rather to have aggravated them. Those who resorted to such measures ought to have foreseen this result. We trust that our friends may continue to exhibit a patient as well as an intrepid spirit.

### *KOSSUTH, INTERVENTION, AND THE PARTIES.*

NON-INTERFERENCE in our domestic affairs has come, at length, it seems, like all other general rules, to have its exception. It was a very good rule to observe so long as it worked well, and anything was to be gained by it, but not so good when more is to be gained by breaking than keeping it. The hint given by the American and Foreign A. S. Society to M. Kossuth, that there was no necessity for his saying anything upon the subject of American Slavery, quite jumped with his own inclination, and the judgment of others—not pretending to be Abolitionists—who, as we happen to know, had given him similar advice. Of course, the ready plea was, that the question of aid to Hungary was not to be trammelled by the prejudices or feelings of any portion of the people on domestic matters. It served its turn, and the great Hungarian went down the Ohio, and the Mississippi, over the Lake to Mobile, and across the country to Charleston, South Carolina. Whether the 'material aid' gained in that tour would have paid the expenses of the journey, had it been used for that purpose, we doubt, but it is not impossible that it brought what is sometimes better than silver and gold—experience. M. Kossuth may be acting now upon this dear-bought knowledge; at any rate, if he has not come to the conclusion that he might as well have spoken his mind upon the subject of Slavery, he has, at least, concluded that the rule laid down for that is not a good rule when applied to other subjects.

If his inquiry had been, on his first arrival—how can I best interfere with everything, in this country, and make myself most felt in all its domestic policy? the ready answer would have been—wait for the commencement of the Presidential campaign, and go into politics. He could by no possibility take any step which would make him so much courted on the one hand, and so much dreaded on the other, as to use his influence successfully to defeat one candidate for the Presidency and elect the other. His success could only depend upon his influence, for the German vote alone is large enough to make that scale kick the beam against which it adds its weight. He seems disposed to make the attempt. His last public meeting was with the Germans in this city, and, in his speech on that occasion, he thus guardedly, but distinctly, lays down what he considers the true platform to be occupied by the Germans in this country:

Finally, I regard it as my duty to utter a few modest words as to the mission of the German citizens of America in their position as citizens. I do it, because the naturalized Germans of Newark have expressly asked me to do so They say that, since the origin of the Union, no Presidential election has had a higher or greater significance than the present. That is true.

They say that the condition of Europe, the voice of the majority of the people, and particularly the interests of the United States, render it an imperative necessity that the course of political isolation which has formerly prevailed must be relinquished, and the principle of active sympathy in the international relations of Europe be established. Therein they are again right.

They say, moreover, that the platforms of the two great parties are deficient, and do not correspond to the spirit of the times—which is also true.

And they say, finally, that they are resolved to support those politics only, which, while they will emancipate Europe, will lead to the enduring welfare of the United States. Now this is a view which, if I had the honour to be a native American citizen, bound by no special ties to Europe, and only anxious to determine my patriotic duty, I would take as my guide.

Even my enemies, who heap me with calumnies and stale jests, which defile them but not me, and who indulge in the most malignant perversion of my language, cannot deny that I have never spoken to the Germans in America without saying that their first and holiest duty in America was to be Americans, and that they should take the true interests of their adopted land, without regard to their personal feelings, as their guide.

I say that, to-day, Virtue is the basis of Republican Government, and there is no virtue which is not patriotic. But as matters now stand, philanthropy is the only true American patriotism. Selfish isolation is either a short-sighted mistake, or an illusion and treason of the passions.

It is a principle of mine never to mingle with any internal question of this country—and I shall not do it. But no one can regard it as an offence to say that Europe is profoundly concerned in the question, as to what course in regard to the foreign policy of the country the future administration may pursue; for my own country and Germany and all Europe are the objects of that policy.

It is proper, therefore, to express my views on that head.

And since my views of that question embrace the whole future of America, and it is that question which is to give the main direction to the next administration, I say that the way which American patriots have to choose is clearly indicated by events. They must not be led by party names or party affinities, but by principles.

Now, one party has already pronounced itself as openly hostile to that view of foreign policy which the German citizens of New York profess, and which I regard as the only salutary view for America; the other has passed it over in silence.

There is, then, nothing dubious here; the hostile declaration has alienated support—but silence leaves the matter so far forth still open. Should the leading organs and leaders of the victorious fraction of the party, which declares itself unfriendly, retract the hostile programme—then the question of principle again recurs—which party will declare itself favourable? But, as the matter is left by the Conventions, it is clear that silence is less unfavourable than declared opposition.

None the less does it appear to me necessary to *let the silent party know that they cannot rest too confidently upon the logical consequences of this dilemma*; for *there is a third course yet open*, viz.: that the German citizens, who agree with the declarations made at Newark, *may unite with a third independent party or refrain from voting*, and thereby prevent a direct choice by the parties, and throw the election into Congress, meanwhile exercising such a constitutional influence in the choice of Representatives in Congress, that the supporters of your policy there may stand as a solid phalanx, to control the policy of the Government.

I do not say that these passive tactics are desirable, but that they are possible.

It is consequently the task of those who accord with the Newark declaration, *to make sure of an authentic interpretation of this silence*. The test relates to the principles which the leading organs of that wing of the silent party which was negatively triumphant in the Convention will maintain Will those organs truly assert those principles and get the support of their candidates for them or not? Let them do that, and the problem is solved as to which side oppressed Europe must wish the victory; but if they do not do it—then nothing remains but to cast the whole influence of the independent party upon the Congressional election, and so keep the balance in its hands.

He reiterates here that principle of his of non-interference with internal questions, but it evidently has a different meaning on this question of voting for President, than that which he gave it on the question of Slavery. *Then* it meant to say nothing upon the subject; *now* it evidently does not mean that; and if it means anything, it is simply that he shall not *personally* interfere in the ensuing election—certainly a very safe assertion, as he will not probably be in the country in November, and could not vote if he were. But he could give no stronger evidence of his wishes and intentions to interfere with all sorts of internal questions than he does in this extract. He tells his German friends what they may do, what they ought not to do, and what they can do. They may vote for the Democratic party, if they will give a favourable interpretation to its silence; they ought not to vote for the Whig party, for that has already spoken; and they may vote for a third party—the Free Soil party, to wit?—if that shall avow for itself a satisfactory European policy; or they may refrain from voting altogether. And in these two last events, their aim is to be to effect that in Congress, which they have failed to compass in casting their votes in the Presidential election.

What will be the influence of this advice, nobody, as yet, pretends to know, or ventures to predict. We, at least, may say that we care as little as we know; but it is quite otherwise with our political contemporaries. The Democrats, on the ore hand, maintain that the Germans should, in following the advice of their illustaious leader, give their votes to Pierce, whose party, though silent on the subject, is the true intervention party. On the other hand, the Whigs, or that portion of them who sympathize with the European movement for freedom, paradoxically maintain that, though their Platform has a non-intervention plank in it, they mean to serve it as they do some other portions of it—not stand upon it, but tread it under their feet. The anxiety of both is justified, for the Germans unquestionably have the power of turning the scale, if they forget their party ties in their sympathies for the Fatherland. We shall watch for the result with that interest with which the good woman observed the fight between a bear and her husband—quite indifferent as to which got *licked*.

### *'UNCLE TOM'S CABIN' AND DR. PARKER, OF PHILADELPHIA.*

MRS. STOWE, in relating one of those terrible but common incidents which necessarily illustrate American Slavery, attributed to the Rev. Dr. Parker, of Philadelphia, the assertion that the system has "no evils but such as are inseparable from any other relations in social and domestic life." Against the charge of having given utterance to so inhuman a sentiment, the Rev. gentleman has never thought it worth his while to defend himself till now, when the attention of a multitude of people is called to it in a way which exposes, not merely its fallacy, but its atrocity also. Its appearance in 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' has called forth the following correspondence, which was published in the morning papers of this city, a few days since. Whether the publication of Mrs. Stowe's letter "is all that is needed to place me (Dr. Parker) right in regard to this unpleasant affair," is a question; as it is not clear which it is that he regrets—that such a sentiment should have been attributed to him at all, or that, standing in the connection that it does, it should have brought upon him so universal a reprobation. Mrs. Stowe was certainly justified in attributing to him an assertion which he had permitted to be so long before the public uncontradicted; he certainly does not justify his long silence by speaking under the present circumstances. The inference is that if he never uttered so objectionable a sentiment, he has been willing to have it supposed that he entertained it.

On another ground, moreover, the correspondence fails to be altogether satisfactory. Dr. Parker thinks, and Mrs. Stowe acknowledges, that she was mistaken in the construction she put upon his language. He does not assert, nor does she admit, that the language was misquoted, but merely that a meaning was given to it which it was not intended to convey. The fact, then, is acknowledged that Dr. Parker did use the terms attributed to him. Mrs. Stowe thinks he did not intend to convey by them their most obvious meaning when spoken in relation to Slavery. After all, if it is a question of inference, as it seems to be, a great many people might agree with Mrs. Stowe, and a great many might disagree with her. All of the latter class, probably, would be glad to know what Dr. Parker did mean, if he did *not* mean what he seemed to say. We rather doubt, however, if they will be gratified, as Dr. Parker will probably rest with the sort of explanation which is thus made:

MRS. H. B. STOWE—*Dear Madam:* I write to ask an interview with you, at such time as may be convenient, for the purpose of laying before you such evidence as will, I think, satisfy you that you have been misled in quoting in your recent work, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," certain language as mine.

I feel deeply aggrieved by the use made of that paragraph, and I am sure that you will not refuse to right me before the public when I shall have laid the whole matter before you. I am, with great respect,

Yours, JOEL PARKER.

DR. JOEL PARKER—*Dear Sir:* I have attentively considered the papers which you left for my examination. I am quite satisfied that the language quoted (pape 191 Vol. 1 of "Uncle Tom's Cabin") conveys a meaning widely different from that which you intended to express in the articles which I have read; and you will allow me to say that my mind is greatly relieved from a painful conviction which I innocently, but, so far as you were concerned, unjustly entertained in regard to your real views.

It is due to myself, however, to state that I did not carelessly employ the language attributed to you. It was published first in American newspapers, re-quoted in English journals (*The British Banner* being one). It was understood to have been employed in a large meeting of Congregational clergymen in England, as one of the evidences of the complicity of American ministers with Slavery. It appeared next in the letter of the English correspondent of *The Independent*, and finally was embodied in the Annual Report of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society for 1851. During all this time you had never publicly contradicted the truth of this representation, and I understood your silence to be an admission of its correctness.

While, therefore, I do not see how I *could* have acted with more caution in employing an allegation which had become historical, I am, yet, heartily glad to find that a sentiment so shocking to every Christian mind is not yours.

I shall order the immediate alteration of the paragraph in question, and shall be glad, in any other way which shall appear proper, to set you right before the public. I am, dear Sir, respectfully yours,

H. B. STOWE.

MRS. H. B. STOWE—*My Dear Madam:* I thank you for your prompt kindness in examining the documents which I submitted to you, and for the favourable opinions which you express. If you will allow me to publish your letter, I think that *that* will be all that is needed to place me right in regard to this unpleasant affair. I am, with unabated esteem,

Yours, JOEL PARKER.

### *PROF. FAIRCHILD AND MISS STONE.*

PROFESSOR HUDSON, late of Oberlin, called on us, a few days since, and before the appearance of the following article in the *Liberator* of last week, to correct the statement made, on behalf of Miss Lucy Stone, at the last New England Convention, in relation to Professor Fairchild, of Oberlin, as well as the mistake of names made by our Boston Correspondent 'D. Y.' in his letter to the *Standard* of May 31st. The error of our correspondent—though he spoke doubtingly as to whether he was right in the name—we regret exceedingly, but we trust it mislead no one, as in the report of the proceedings of the Convention, also published in our columns, the reader would observe that it was Professor Fairchild, and not Professor Hudson, who was alluded to.

Our correspondent, we learn from the same source, committed one or two other mistakes in the same letter, which, though of little consequence, may as well be corrected. President Mahan is not now, and has not been for some time, connected with Oberlin, nor is he now in England.

That the statement in regard to Professor Fairchild was erroneous, the following correspondence shows. We most cheerfully and gladly copy it, fully coinciding with the spirit of the remarks by which it is prefaced by the editor of the *Liberator*. As every story has its moral, we presume that of this one to be, that young ladies should be careful how they trust to the word of students in divinity:

CLEAN HANDS.

It is with great satisfaction we publish the following letters, fully exculpating Prof. Fairchild, of Oberlin, from a serious charge incidentally brought against him at the late New England Anti-Slavery Convention, during a discussion relating almost exclusively to Pres. Mahan—a serious charge, we repeat, but not in popular estimation, not according to the recognised standard of piety in the American Church (for inheriting, holding, breeding, buying and selling the children of God, as property, is not deemed a criminal act either by that body or the public at large), but only in the judgment of such as believe that no man was ever created to be the property of another, and that slaveholding is a heinous sin against God. As the injustice done, in this instance, to Prof. Fairchild was without design or malice, so is the very first opportunity improved to make reparation. All such mistakes are much to be regretted, while their correction is ever an occasion of unalloyed satisfaction to every upright heart. The

spirit exhibited by Prof. F., in his letter to Miss Stone, is without the slightest taint of bitterness, and worthy both of praise and imitation. We are sure that the Anti-Slavery *Standard*, Pennsylvania *Freeman*, and Ohio *Bugle*, will cheerfully allow his statements (so honourable to Mrs. F. and to himself), touching the slave property inherited by her, a place in their columns.—*Ed. Lib.*

PROF. FAIRCHILD—CORRECTION.

WEST BROOKFIELD, June 22, 1852.

FRIEND GARRISON: Will you please give the accompanying letter, from Prof. Fairchild, of Oberlin, a place in the *Liberator*? It is due to him, and to the truth.

The statements, which I am glad he is able so fully to disprove, were made to me by a theological student of Oberlin, in whose veracity I have the fullest confidence; but who, it seems, had been misinformed, or had misunderstood the facts.

Prof. Fairchild thinks I should have inquired of him as to the truth of such a 'slander,' before I made it public. The event shows that it would have been better; though, from the character of my informant, I believed it, just as I should if the same statement had been made to me by Prof. Fairchild himself, relative to another. Up to that time, I had had great respect for him, and heard the statement sadly, feeling that we all need to pray, 'Lead *us* not into temptation'—for

'Earth's best
Find but in flight their safety.'

It was not from 'ill will' toward Prof. Fairchild, for I have none; nor from a desire to injure the institution with which he is connected, for I have no such desire; nor did 'the excitement of the moment betray me into a mistake.' The whole subject, relative to Oberlin, was incidental; growing out of the infamous letter of President Mahan, that appeared in the Glasgow *Examiner*. What I said was designed as added proof to that which undeniably exists, that it is not without reason that the agents of the Anti-Slavery Society find fault with the church of Oberlin. I am glad that the fact I stated is *not* a fact, as well for the sake of Oberlin as for the slave's sake; for Oberlin has now more than it can ever answer to the slave, in its fellowship of those who fellowship slaveholders.

Yours, for truth and justice,
LUCY STONE.

OBERLIN, June 15th, 1852.

MY FRIEND, MISS STONE: It was with surprise and sorrow that I read, in a recent number of the *Liberator*, a charge brought against me, by Mr. May, on your authority and in your behalf. You seemed grieved that such a thing should be true of any one connected with Oberlin. You will, therefore, be relieved when I tell you that, notwithstanding your 'perfectly good authority,' the statement is utterly false.

But let me ask, Miss Stone, whether, considering the relation we have sustained to each other, I had not a right to expect that you would communicate with me, in reference to such a slander, before you took the responsibility of publicly proclaiming it. Fidelity to truth might require of you the exposure of such a sin, but, certainly, not until you had used the most simple and direct means for ascertaining the facts.

You and I have differed in opinion on some questions, but I was not before aware that we had doubted each other's integrity. An idle rumour, however plausible, would not justify either of us in assuming that the other was a hypocrite. 'Suspicion is a bad counsellor; the wisdom of charity is better.'

The facts, so strangely perverted, are these. By the laws of Louisiana, half of my father-in-law's estate was divided among six children; the other half went to the widow. This division could be effected only by a public sale of the property. We directed our attorney, there, to bid off at the sale a young slave, if my wife's share should be sufficient, and forward him to Ohio at our expense. My wife's share amounted to $425. Of this sum, $350 were paid for a young girl, between five and six years old, and the balance, $75, saved to pay for her transportation to this place, and for her support and education after she reached us. You can judge yourself whether it was more than adequate.

Beyond this, we have not received one farthing from the estate, and have no claim upon it. The 'two coloured women' that fell to my wife never had an existence.

My first house was built by myself—by money which my own father gave me. The second 'larger and better one,' as you are pleased to call it, was obtained in exchange for this, and by money which I saved myself on a salary of $400 per year, without doing injustice to any one, and, as I hope, without meanness. Mr. Foote's suggestion, in reference to 'contributions of students,' was a misapprehension of his, though kindly meant. No such contributions were ever made to me personally. A society of students and Alumni made contributions to the college, for the payment of my yearly salary. Every dollar of their contributions was credited to the college.

The facts as above stated are known to all my friends, and could be substantiated, if necessary, in any court of justice. I have done nothing in the case to conceal—nothing to publish. The most I could do was to be just—less than this I did not think that any one acquainted with me would suspect me of doing.

The Anti-Slavery *Standard*, by a blunder of Edmund Quincy ('D. Y.'), makes Professor Hudson the guilty one. You certainly will acquit *him*. This misrepresentation does not affect me personally, because I have no public reputation to sustain, and, at home, justice will be done me. It affects more, and was apparently designed to affect, the school with which I am connected.

You can decide for yourself whether a correction is due from you. I have written to Mr. May, of Syracuse.* Perhaps he will make the proper correction. I did not then think of writing to you; but, on further consideration, it seemed to me right that you should be informed of the facts. It would have been more agreeable to me to give the facts in answer to an inquiry from yourself. Beyond these explanations to yourself and Mr. May, I shall not probably make any effort at correction.

I have not been able to believe that you were influenced by any feelings of ill will towards me. The excitement of the moment betrayed you into a mistake, which you would not justify upon more mature reflection. Sincerely your friend, J. H. FAIRCHILD.

Prof. Fairchild has mistaken Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, for Samuel May, Jr., the much esteemed General Agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

## *JAMES PHILLIPS.*

IN the *Standard* of June 10th may be found an account of the last Slave-hunt in Pennsylvania, when a man by the name of Phillips, who had for years been an industrious and respectable citizen of Harrisburg, in that State, was brutally knocked on the head, to render his capture certain, and then taken, in a state of insensibility, before Commissioner McAllister, who mocked and insulted him with a sham trial, and delivered him over to his captors, as a slave for life. His case excited a deep feeling of indignation among the people of Harrisburg, from the manner of his capture and the character of the pretended trial which was awarded him, and also moved their sympathies for his probable fate, and for the sudden desolation which had thus fallen upon his wife. An effort, it was said, was to be made to purchase him from the ruffian who claimed him as his slave, but the attempt, if any has been made, to raise the necessary funds has been, it seems, unsuccessful. The last number of the Harrisburg *Standard* publishes the following letter from him to his wife:

RICHMOND, June 30th, 1852.

DEAR WIFE: I will now write to you to inform you where I am and of my health. I am well, and I am in hopes when you receive this it may find you well also. I am now in a trader's hands, by the name of Mr. Branton, and he is agoing to start South with a lot of negroes in August. I do not like this country at all, and had almost rather die than to go South. Tell all of the people if they can do anything for me, now is the time to do it. I can be bought for $900. Do pray try and get Brant and Mr. Byers and Mr. Weaver to send or come on to buy me, and if they only will buy me back, I will be a faithful man to them so long as I live. Show Mr. Brant and Mr. Weaver th's letter, and tell them to come on as soon as they possibly can to buy me. My master is willing to sell me to any gentleman who will be so kind as to come on to buy me. They have got poor James Phillips here with leg irons on, to keep him from getting away; and do pray, gentlemen, not feel any hesitation at all, but come on as soon as you can and buy me. Feel for me now or never. If any of you will be so kind as to come on to buy me, enquire for Cochron's Jail. I can be found there, and my master is always at the Jail himself. My master gave me full consent to have this letter written, so do not feel any hesitation to come on and see about poor James Phillips. Dear wife, show it to these men as soon as you get it and let them write back immediately what they intend to do. Direct your letter to my master, William A. Branton, Richmond, Va. Try and do something for me as soon as you can, for I want to get back very bad indeed. Do not think anything at all of the price, for I am worth twice that amount. I can make it for any person who will buy me, in a short time. I have nothing more to write, only wish I may be bought and carried back to Harrisburg in a short time. My best love to you my wife. You may depend I am almost a dying to see you and my children. You must do all you can for your husband.

Your Husband, JAMES PHILLIPS.

To Mrs. Mary Phillips, in care of Mr. John H. Brant.

This appeal is seconded by the editor of the Harrisburg *Standard*, who has opened a communication with Branton, the master. He asks for donations to the fund of $900, which it is necessary to create for the redemption of Phillips, and will acknowledge all that may be received in the columns of his paper. Letters should be addressed to Geo. P. Crap, publisher of the Harrisburg *Standard*.

WE give below a report of the first day's proceedings of the trial of Henry W. Allen, Deputy U. S. Marshal, before the Supreme Court of this State, for the kidnapping of the alleged fugitive slave Jerry, in September last. The attention of the Court, on the following days, was occupied in hearing the pleas of Counsel, no report, however, of which, has yet appeared, except the speech of Mr. Gerrit Smith. For that we shall find room next week. The case is concluded, the jury having brought in a verdict of not guilty.

## ALLEGED CASE OF KIDNAPPING.

THE PEOPLE *vs.* HENRY W. ALLEN.

*Supreme Court of New York—Onondaga County—June* 21, 1842.

Before his Honour, C. MARVIN, Judge of the 8th Judicial District.

Reported by L. W. Crandall, Esq., for the *Syracuse Star*.

This case is the first one of the kind that has been brought since the Constitution of the United States was adopted. It therefore possesses, on that account, an importance which could not otherwise attach to it.

HENRY W. ALLEN, the defendant, is Deputy United States Marshal. As such, a warrant, issued by JOSEPH F. SABINE, United States Commissioner, for the arrest of one Jerry, otherwise called William Henry, on the 29th of September, 1851, was placed in his hands. It was alleged in said warrant that said Jerry owed "service and labour" to a party in Missouri. On the next day—1st of October—Allen executed the warrant, by the arrest of the man Jerry, who was brought by him before Commissioner Sabine for examination, with a view to deciding whether he should be returned to Missouri, on the claim set up in the warrant.

Before this examination was concluded, it is well known that Jerry left for parts unknown, so far as the records of the U. S. Commissioner show.

Marshal ALLEN was presented before the Grand Jury of Onondaga County, at the October session of the County Court, 1851, for indictment under a law of the State of New York, of 1840, to protect the rights of its citizens—or against kidnapping.

The Grand Jury found a true bill against Marshal Henry W. Allen, under said act for kidnapping, in arresting Jerry under said warrant.

And hence the case set down for this day, 21st June, 1852, at the Onondaga Circuit, before Justice Marvin.

The proceedings of Marshal Allen were founded on the Act called the Fugitive Slave Law, passed September, 1850.

The proceedings before the Grand Jury, on which Marshal Allen was indicted, were founded on an Act of the Legislature of New York, of 1849.

It would seem—the Reporter would beg leave to say—that the question in this case is, whether, in the State of New York, any man has the right, on any authority whatever, to place another person, who has not committed crime, and is not charged with crime, or breach of contract, in *durance vile*, with impunity. Marshal Allen, in the arrest of Jerry, acted in conformity to the law of Congress of September, 1850,—which would seem to make the issue, that that law is inconsistent with the constitutional rights of the people of the State of New York.

Counsel for the People.—ROWLAND H. GARDNER, District Attorney of Onondaga County, CHARLES B. SEDGWICK, and GERRIT SMITH.

For the Defendant.—United States District Attorney JAMES R. LAWRENCE, GEORGE F. COMSTOCK, and STEPHEN D. DILLAYE.

At 10 minutes before 10 o'clock, the case was called, when—

Mr. SEDGWICK stated that the witnesses for the prosecution had been subpœned, but were not present in Court. The case was reserved.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

At half-past 3 o'clock, the case was again called.

The following Jury was empanneled: Samuel Gilley, Zenas Wright, Benjamin Youngs, Orange Hill, Wm. K. Blair, Seth Rhoades, Elias W. Benson, Wm. Van Alstine, Wm. Wickham, Richard Patton, Warren Austin, Wm. K. Skinner.

As soon as the panel was completed, Mr. Lawrence called for the names.

They were read over by the Clerk.

Mr. LAWRENCE enquired if there were any more names in the box? [Clerk: There are.]

Mr. LAWRENCE raised the question whether the defence had the affirmative. The indictment charges the dendant with force and arms, and without authority of law, arresting one Jerry, a man of colour. The indictment is under the statute of 1840, sec 28. Mr. L read the section of the statute, imposing a fine of $500, and ten years of imprisonment, for kidnapping. Mr. L then read documents showing that the defendant acted in conformity to law—including the warrant issued by United States Commissioner Sabine, for the arrest of Jerry, with a view to his return to John McReynolds, of Missouri, as a fugitive from service and labour. It included also the return of Marshal, to the warrant. The defendant denies that the people of the State of New York, can prosecute him.

Mr. L. went on to remark that in reply, the prosecution simply deny the facts set forth as to the issuing of a warrant; deny that Sabine was a United States Commissioner; that he was duly appointed; deny that he had a right to issue the warrant, &c.

Mr. L. said: We suppose that all we have to do is to attend to the facts herein denied, and prove them to be true; and we suppose that we have the affirmative.

Mr. C. B. SEDGWICK did not so understand the state of the case. Marshal Allen—it is claimed by the people—did feloniously, &c., take the man Jerry, without authority of law. He supposed that the defendant's counsel would not admit the indictment, but intended merely a special plea. The defendant must either admit or deny what is charged. Such is the English law Archbold's Criminal Pleading, 86th page, and such is our own law. The counsel read to show that the only case where a special plea was admissible was, when a county or town is indicted in reference to the repair of a bridge, in order to proceed to show that other parties ought to have done the work. In this case, the case is admitted; but the attempt is made to show that other parties are at fault. Counsel also read from page 94, that the prosecution is bound to show the offence, and that the defence can show everything going to rebut the allegations of the prosecution.

Counsel referred to 24 Revised Statutes, page 611. The party arraigned may demand trial—and a plea of *not guilty* is to be entered by the Court, in all cases wherein the truth of the indictment is not admitted. He went on to say, that it was competent for the Prosecution, under the indictment, to prove that Marshal Allen did things in reference to Jerry out of the Warrant. They therefore proposed to go on and prove these things, under the traverse of the indictment.

The COURT: Mr. Sedgwick, what am I to do? Here is an issue sent down from the Supreme Court, to be tried. What can I do but try that issue as presented?

Mr. SEDGWICK: I suppose you are to try the question, under the indictment, as it would be done in any Court. That you are to try, the case as in any Oyer and Terminer.

The COURT spoke of it, as a special issue, arising from the Defendant's special plea. That the case would be confined to the special plea, when no further answer was made by the Prosecution. If Mr. Sedgwick is right, are we in a position to try the case at all?

Mr. SEDGWICK supposed that the case must be tried on the indictments, unless the Defendant admitted it to be true.

The COURT referred to the practice in trying immaterial issues sent down, &c. It called Mr. Lawrence's attention to the fact, that Mr. Sedgwick expected the case would be tried on the original pleadings.

Mr. LAWRENCE said a special plea in a criminal case, was good. You are not precluded from it. They have not demurred. They have made certain allegations. We say all we did, was to take the man on the Warrant, and bring him into Court. They denied that we did it. The whole object of the special plea, was to obviate the necessity of testimony. What have we consented to try? That Sabine was Commissioner—that he issued the Warrant—that Marshal Allen arrested Jerry on it—and that is the end of the case. He contended that Archbold did not preclude them from pleading specially. It was done in civic cases, to save the expense of testimony. He went on to read from Archbold, that only in certain cases a special plea "seems requisite." We always had a right, in criminal cases, to plead specially. It was never intended to preclude the right. In certain cases, it is necessary. He claimed that by the authority, they had a right to plead specially any thing in bar. The Statute of our State read by Mr. Sedgwick had nothing to do with the pleadings as in this case.

The COURT: It is agreed by all of you, that a plea of "Not Guilty," would be a good plea.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Very well. We admit that we did take the man—but that we took him properly, and deny that we did any thing more than we state. Mr. L. read from Wharton's Precedents to Indictments, to show that in Massachusetts special pleas were good. He maintained that no authority against special pleas, could be shown. We are to have the affirmative. How can they begin? What have they to show? By the pleadings, they have consented that when we have proved the warrant, and the arrest under it, the case is ended. They can not go on and show that other things were done.

Mr. SEDGWICK said the gentleman did not seem to apprehend the point in the case. The reply of Defendant, is a general denial of the indictment—and that is a plea of "Not Guilty." The statute says, if the Defendant does not deny the indictment, he confesses it. He says also, that he acted by authority of law—we say he did not—and here is an issue. We are bound under that plea, to go on and prove that he did what is charged, and without authority of law. There was no such thing under the laws of this State, as a prisoner escaping from a trial by any trick of special pleadings. He referred to the statute of this State.

The COURT requested its reading again.

Mr. SEDGWICK read, and continued: The statute applies precisely. The Defendant, in his pleadings, denies the truth of the indictment, and that brings up the whole case, from the starting point.

Mr. LAWRENCE: According to your argument, you could have no special plea.

Mr. SEDGWICK: He can make the plea *autre fois acquit*—but by that you confess to the charge in the indictment: admits he has been tried on it, and therefore cannot be tried again. By this Statute, if a defendant denies the indictment, it is a plea of "Not Guilty." The Defendant here has denied the indictment—and that makes an issue. We admit all they claim in reward to the action of the Commissioner, Marshal, &c.; but we have come to try the body of the indictment. The question is not one of form, as raised by the counsel, but one of substance—as to what we are to try. From this, there is no escape.

The COURT: The Pleadings present a singular state of facts. I know of no way, but to try the issues the parties have seen fit to make. Read from the Statute, in regard to kidnapping. The Indictment substantially follows the statute. The Defendant then comes in, and says he acted according to law. He then avers that this is his offence as charged and that he has done no more. The People, instead of demurring, take issue on it. Now, is not this the issue before me? If I regard it as a mere plea of "Not Guilty," I must strike out all these pleadings. Can I do this? In another place—in the General Term, he could bear the motion. But here he had only to hear the issues as presented. He had decided notions as to this form of pleading—but he would not give them. He could not see what the Jury could find upon, except the issues presented by the pleadings. To say the least of it, it is a very unusual way of pleading.

Mr. SEDGWICK: I suppose the Jury are to find whether this Defendant is guilty or not guilty? not whether Sabine is Commissioner, and Allen a Marshal.

The COURT expressed assent.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Guilty of what?

Mr. SEDGWICK: Guilty of attempting feloniously to take a man from the States of New York—"Kidnapping" in technical language.

It was then agreed that the defence was to proceed, as first claimed by Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. GEORGE F. COMSTOCK then read the following stipulation:

Supreme Court,
The People
vs.
Henry Allen.

It is stipulated to admit on the trial of this cause, that on the 1st day of October last, Joseph F. Sabine, Esq., was a Commissioner of the United States Circuit Court, appointed by order of that Court, entered on the 27th day of June, 1849; that on that day as such Commissioner he issued the warrant hereto annexed, to the defendant in this cause as Deputy Marshal of the United States; that the defendant or some Deputy Marshal, executing said warrant on the same day by arresting Jerry therein named, and bringing him before the said Commissioner, and that he made his return to said warrant, which is endorsed thereon.

R. H. GARDINER, Dist. Att'y.

Mr. SEDGWICK read a stipulation as to the facts in reference to James Lear's coming from Missouri for Jerry.

Mr. SEDGWICK then called Frederick Morrell. No answer. He then called Joseph F. Sabine.

Mr. LAWRENCE asked what he wished to prove?

Mr. SEDGWICK said he wished to prove by Morrell, that for some time Jerry had been a resident.

It was contended and agreed that Jerry was such resident.

Mr. LAWRENCE desired to know what counsel desired to prove?

Mr. SEDGWICK: By Mr. Sabine, we propose to show, that the defendant took measures to keep Jerry after the return was made on the warrant.

Mr. COMSTOCK: That is beyond the pleadings, and is therefore excluded.

Mr. SEDGWICK: We may as well state the whole case. We propose to show that Allen took measures before the warrant was issued to secure Jerry for the purpose of retaining him, and acts after the warrant was returned.

The COURT suggested, that if there were any charges in the indictment not admitted in the special plea, they were confessed; and it was not necessary to go into the proof.

Mr. SEDGWICK thought we were in danger of confusion, by confounding civil with criminal pleadings.

Mr. COMSTOCK: They charge us with attempting to remove a man without authority of law. We admit that we attempted to remove the man—but showed the authority. They simply put themselves, in their plea, on a denial of the facts. The special pleading in a criminal case, does not differ from special pleading in a civil case. What do they propose to show? That the Defendant has acted outside of the warrant. He supposed that some great principle was at stake—a constitutional principle. He was prepared for that, and to show the unconstitutionality of the law of New York under which this indictment was found.

The COURT: It is intended, I suppose, to raise the constitutional question.

Mr. SEDGWICK: It is.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Not here—before this Court.—Elsewhere it may be raised.

Mr. SEDGWICK: It will be a fine time to raise that question after the prisoner has gone.

Mr. LAWRENCE went on to insist that the Prosecution were attempting to change the issue. They have said to us, "If you prove what is your special plea, there is an end of the case." That is the language of the plea. He insisted, that, as they had not demurred, the constitutional question could not be raised. The facts are all made out, that we alleged—we have proven that the issue as sent here to be tried, is all true as maintained by us—and yet are we to be beat?

The COURT supposed that there was a general understanding as to the facts, but that the Prosecution denied that the warrant was a warrant—that it was good for nothing.

Mr. SEDGWICK: Yes, sir; that is the very question we expected to meet.

Mr. LAWRENCE thought otherwise. When the Defendant plead, he supposed the prosecution would demur.

The COURT thought the Constitutional question could be raised under the pleadings.

Mr. COMSTOCK said the particular question now up, was, whether the Prosecution could come into Court with testimony not referred to in the pleadings.

The COURT decided that the testimony offered could not be admitted.

The case was therefore declared closed.

The COURT then suggested that the Counsel amicably agree among themselves as to the order of summing up. The case was under the laws of this State; it was charged that an offence had been committed against the laws of this State; on the other hand, that the act was done under authority of the laws of the United States; again on the other, that the law of Congress was unconstitutional, and therefore void.

Mr. SEDGWICK said he had suggested, that the Prosecution open the argument.

This was assented to. After a short recess—

Mr. SEDGWICK said, that in view of Mr. Comstock's intimation that he would maintain the unconstitutionality of the 26th section (Rev. Statutes, 4d Ed.), and the law of New York, under which this indictment was found, he would make a statement of the history and provisions of the law of New York, under which this indictment was found, and proceeded to do so.

When he had concluded, it was agreed that the Court would adjourn till 8 o'clock to-morrow morning, when Mr. Smith was to commence his argument for the prosecution.

DEATH OF HON. HENRY CLAY.—The telegraph announces the death of Mr. Clay, at Washington, on Tuesday morning of this week.

A PARTY OUT OF EMPLOYMENT.—We presume we shall hear no more of Mr. Webster as a candidate for the Presidency. In the language of the elder Mr. Weller—"He "has been took at last with that ere unawoidable fit of the "staggers as we must all come to, and has gone off his feed "forever! I see him" (to continue in the language of Mr. Weller) "getting every journey more and more groggy—I says "to Samival, says I, 'Samivel, my boy, the Gray's a-going at "the knees; and now my perdiction is fatally verified, and "him as I never could do enough to serve, or to show my "likin' for, is up the great universal spout o' natur!'"

It would be a source of satisfaction to Mr. Webster's friends to know that though he has been a candidate of the Whig party some four or five different times, he never got as many votes before as at the last convention.

There is another fact which we desire to improve for the benefit of those wounded spirits, whose fortunes, with their leaders, are like "the Grays, a-going at the knees." Mr. Webster did not *receive on either of the fifty-three ballottings in the Whig Convention, a single Southern vote.* There are some who would call that, scripturally speaking, "returning good for evil." We say nothing.

Great curiosity is now felt to know to what great enterprise those thousand sanguine gentlemen, who went on to Baltimore to bring home the nomination of Webster, will now devote themselves. What project is there sufficiently desperate, or what speculation sufficiently hopeless, to take the place of that of which the verdict of the Whig Committee has just deprived them. Some of them they will set out in search of Sir John Franklin. The difficulty about that is, that reasonable people have not yet quite abandoned all hope of the unfortunate navigator's recovery. Others think they will turn in and support Scott for the Presidency, which has the advantage of furnishing immediate employment; the possibility of his election being no longer seriously entertained by any considerable number of the party.

We have a suggestion worth a dozen of these, one admirably adapted to the wants of the sanguine and hopeful individuals about whom so much concern is naturally felt. Let them lease the eastern extremity of Fire Island, and go to raising geese from gooseberries. The soil in that locality is as well, if not better, adapted to such a crop than to any other, and though the immediate profits of the speculation might not be very great, all those who had the least hope of having Webster for their next President might enjoy, for an unlimited period of time, the most unbounded confidence in their ultimate success.

If the parties should feel indisposed to place so much capital in any one speculation, so many eggs in one basket, they may appropriate part of their land to horse-chesnuts, the demand for horses of late years, since the institution of omnibuses, having been far greater than the supply.

We can assure Mr. Webster's friends that there is neither such a degree of practicability or reasonableness in either of these projects as should deter them from engaging in one or both at once. The sooner they find something to do the better.

"For Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do."—[Evening Post.

## Domestic Correspondence.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. CVI.

THE ARGUMENT.—*The Correspondent sigheth for the last week—His magnanimity towards the Corresponding Editor—His sufferings in consequence thereof—He defendeth his orthodoxy—Comparative Blasphemy—Cursing and swearing in State street—"The complete Swearer"—Blasphemy extraordinary—The correspondent shuddereth—He maketh a castigatory suggestion—Swearing and Crying physiologically compared—The Webster Whig fix—The Boston papers—The Courier's question—The Correspondent answereth it—He giveth his opinion—He illustrateth by an appropriate anecdote, &c., &., &c.*

BOSTON, June 28th, 1842.

I WISH I had written to you this day week. I was then full of matter. I am afraid that I shall not do justice to the wealth of topics which last week abounded in. To be sure your Corresponding Editor did pretty well. Substantially, I agree with the statements of his article. You know I have little reason to speak well of that individual, considering the cool manner in which he has appropriated the glory of my letters to himself. His assurance in that particular being only equal to that of Mr. Wilmot when he stole Mr. Webster's Thunder, some five years agone. However, in the main, I say *ditto* to him. And this, although I shall be obliged to differ in opinion from the *Boston Courier* and sundry other Webster papers, from which it gives me incredible pain to differ, who have expressed a somewhat unfavourable sense of some parts of that article; especially of one passage which had a slightly theological bearing. I must say, whatever personal grounds of complaint I may have against your coadjutor, that truth compels me to bear witness to the soundness of his orthodoxy, which those prints were disposed to call in question. For I have heard him, more than once, declare that he had surmounted all the doubts which (so called) liberal surroundings had suggested as to the doctrines of Total Depravity and the Eternity of Hell Torments—being satisfied that the invention and support of the Fugitive Slave Law could be accounted for only on the hypothesis of the first doctrine, and that its inventors and sustainers could be fitly punished only by the literal truth of the last. However, it is none of my business to defend *him*—so I will proceed with my epistle.

Though I will not undertake to say whether your Corresponding Editor was blasphemous or not in his last editorial, I think you could have no doubt as to whether the Webster Whigs were so or not, if you had been in State Street, when the news of Scott's nomination came in. Taller cursing and swearing I think you never could have heard, though you have lived in New Orleans and Out West. If nobody were clothed with curses as a garment, it was not because those zealous manufacturers had not turned out plenty of the RAW Material. If anybody had been disposed to prepare a Manual to be entitled "the Complete Swearer, or Cursing considered as an Exact Science," or "as a Fine Art," just as he regarded it, such a body might have found instructive lessons there. The way in which those patriotic worthies put their immortal souls in peril, was a Caution to Impenitent Sinners. And it was n't common cursing and swearing, let me tell you. The Blasphemies uttered were of a nature to make even the most callous, who retained any sense of duty to his country, tremble at the hearing. I am almost afraid to put them on paper. But what do you think of a zealous Whig being heard (I shudder as I write!) to d—n Henry Clay!! And this was not the worst, incredible as it may seem that anything could be worse. An active Whig was actually heard (but this is in strict confidence, and is to go no farther) to d—n the Slaveholders! Surely, the force of blasphemy could go no further. Had this contumacious and rebellious spirit lasted (which, I am happy to assure you, it did not), I should have felt bound to advise Mr. Clay and their other Southern owners to send an overseer to administer "the usual correction" (such as poor Sims had at Savannah) to their discontented white slaves. I think if half a dozen merchants and one or two lawyers had been tied up by the thumbs to the lamp-post opposite the Old State House, and forty lashes save one been well laid on, it would have had a tranquilizing effect on the rest, and have secured a better behaviour for the future. And unlike their *black* slaves, they would have liked it. They would have licked the hand that *licked* them.

The conduct of their Southern masters towards these unlucky chattels of theirs was peculiarly provoking. In fact, it prevented their having any relief but swearing, which, you know, some philosophers say is given to men as the same relief which women find in *crying*. When they objected to Scott, the question naturally arose, what is the matter with him? Why he is not sound on the Compromises? But he is sound enough for Mr. Clay and the Slaveholders, enough of whom voted for him to secure his nomination; and all of whom, South Carolina and all, confirmed it unanimously! Is Massachusetts bound to be more jealous for Slavery than the Slaveholders themselves? It would seem so. Here we have been hearing of nothing else for the last two years and a half, but the necessity of doing justice to the South and of having a President that would satisfy the South; and now the South has chosen its man, these superlative patriots say he is not pro-slavery enough for them! Really, gentlemen, I think you may leave Slavery to the care of Mr. Clay and the Slaveholders. They know what they are about, and if they had thought Mr. Webster would have answered their purpose as well as General Scott, you may be assured that they would have nominated him. You may vote for him with a perfectly safe conscience. You surely don't mean to say that you caught Sims merely to get Mr. Webster nominated? Perish the thought! And when any of the Webster Whigs declare that they will vote for Gen. Pierce, the Free Soilers clap them on the shoulder and say "that's right! That is just what Wilson and Allen did at Philadelphia four years ago, and what we have done, viz., *bolted from the Whig Party because Mr. Webster was not nominated!*" This brings them up with a short turn.

You have seen the Boston papers and enjoyed the various howlings and whinings by which they have vented their spleen. The poor little *Transcript* blubbered; the more robust *Courier* blustered a little, but soon drew in its horns. It wanted to know "*why* the great New England Statesman was not nominated?" And the *Post*, which, as an advocate of Gen. Pierce, was naturally desirous of having as weak an antagonist as possible, joined in the indignation, and thought the inquiry a very pertinent one. Now, if those editors really want to know the reason why Mr. Webster failed of the Nomination, I can tell them. It was because he could n't get votes enough! It was because of 194 delegates, there was, at the best, only 32 that wanted him to 62 that did n't! And at the last voting, only 19 to 176! or thereabouts. I think this is a very sufficient explanation. Now, if Gen. Scott's nomination is one "not fit to be made," it is very clear that it is the fault of Mr. Webster's friends that he got it. For they could at any balloting, before the two last, have nominated Mr. Fillmore. And why should not thirty men go over to a hundred and thirty, rather than the other way? If Gen Scott is a bad candidate, it is the dog-in-the-mangerism of Mr. Webster and his friends that is a candidate at all. That is, in the supposition that the Southern delegates were sincere in their support of Mr. Fillmore. It is my opinion that they only voted for him to prevent an election and, perhaps, procure the nomination of Mr. Crittenden, or some other Slaveholder; or, if not, to nominate Gen. Scott. Of the three candidates, they meant, I shall always believe, to have Scott, as the one that had the best chance (the only chance, indeed) of an election, and to have played their game accordingly.

You will be glad to hear, however, that the blasphemies against the Slaveholders are all taken back. The strong intimations that they might catch their own niggers hereafter have been withdrawn. It was not the Slaveholders that caused Webster's rejection: it was the New England Scott men! They were entreated, almost with tears (*quite*, I have no doubt), to change their votes from the man they preferred, just at the moment of success, to the man they did n't want, and knew had no possibility of popular election! What hard-hearted varlets! Can one wonder at the seething indignation of Mr. Webster's friends? Pray, why should not the Webster men have done the same for them? It seems that 100 Southerners agreed to vote for Webster provided forty more votes could be got for him at the North. Did it never occur to these dupes, or are they shamming, that that offer never would have been made (if it were) if those that made it had not been emphatically certain that it could not be complied with. They were only hindered from at least giving Mr. Webster the compliment of a few votes by the fear of their confederates gaining for Scott, it seems! But what hindred their paying him that compliment at the last ballotting, when it was absolutely certain that Scott would be nominated? Nothing but their resolution that he should have no vote of theirs. A resolution founded on a feeling expressed to a Free Soil Member of Congress by a Southern Whig (you may rely on the anecdote as unquestionable), when asked by him why he and his party went for Fillmore instead of Webster, "It is because," said he, "that, though we love the treason, we despise the traitor!" The saying was not original, to be sure, but it was apt and expressive, and expressed the very secret of Mr. Webster's defeat. But I must stop before I have fairly begun.

D. Y.

## Communications.

### *G. W. F. MELLEN ON HABEAS CORPUS.*

MR GAY: In the report you have published of the doings of the New England Anti-Slavery Convention, it says, that a "G. W. F. Mellen got the floor, and read an anonymous letter to himself. His remarks were ruled out of order. The Convention, on an appeal, sustained the chair, and Mr. Mellen took his seat."

From this report it would seem as if Mr. Mellen was ruled out of order by reading the letter. This was not the fact. He had got through reading the letter, and had commenced to address the audience, in part to answer an idea expressed by Mr. Barker, and to explain the reason why the American Anti-Slavery Society, as he supposed from Mr. Barker's remarks, he thought were in a cloud, and incidentally mentioned the *Habeas Corpus* as a means which, if put in force, would bring them out of that cloud, when the Chairman (Mr. Quincy) called me to order, stating at the time that *that* subject was not before the meeting.

In order to be understood, he trusts you will permit him to say to your readers, that it is upon this point he has always been called to order, and, if he understands aright, the Anti-Slavery Society, appear determined that no one shall use, or shall come to the knowledge, that any one ever did, or, ever can, use that great writ in behalf of the freedom of the slave. Permit me, therefore, to say, that it is with profound astonishment and regret that, before a meeting of those, who have taken a lead in the moral aspect of the cause of the slave, they should utterly deny even the hearing of what may be said in behalf of its use in the premises; it being the only legal means the Constitution of our country, or that of England, points out for a person, whether held in restraint as a slave, or for any other cause, by which he can gain his freedom. Why such a course is pursued, is beyond his comprehension; he knows of but one reason, and let him state it to you and your readers.

I think as long ago as 1837 or 8, I introduced a resolution affirming the power of the general government to break up Slavery in the States, or its unconstitutionality, and it was passed by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. At its next meeting, at Dedham, I observed, among the proceedings of the Society, that resolution was taken up and laid upon the table. I called on Mr. E. G. Loring to know the reason, and he showed me a letter written by Judge Jay, in which he spoke of the position taken by the Society, in adopting that resolution, as a new step, and wanted to know, if I remember right, if the Society meant to maintain that position. Mr. Loring intimated to me that it was in consequence of that letter the resolution as above stated was laid upon the table, and the discussion of the whole subject since then has been considered out of order. I do not recollect the time I have not been called to order the moment I have mentioned the Habeas Corpus, and, in order to keep it before the people, I have been careful always to introduce it in my speeches. The contrary doctrine, on the other hand, that is, that the Constitution is pro-slavery, our fathers deceivers, and the free governments they built a humbug, may be asserted, and taught, with all the eloquence that can be commanded, without let or hindrance.

Let me say to Judge Jay, that letter of his has been a fatal one, and I hope he will recall it. It has completely gagged me for the past fourteen or fifteen years, in all our meetings, so far as it has been possible. I have long since felt restive under its baneful influence. I do not believe that Slavery is Constitutional, and I want to have the privilege of saying it, and giving my reasons without being gagged. Nothing is so provoking—nothing gives me more unpleasant thoughts and feelings. I do not like to be so tried; I cannot think it right; I do not say that there may not be other causes; there may be such; others have been suggested, and private causes are always operating in opposition to the action of individuals. While I say it is thought the letter of Judge Jay has been the principle cause of this opposition, let me solemnly protest against the manner in which our fugitives from service have been defended in our courts of law, and particularly in which Judge Jay, as well as others, have done it. Since the Madison Papers have been published, it is well known, that the idea of property in man was carefully and with intent excluded from the Constitution. What right, then, has a court who holds all its authority under that instrument, to recognise the relation of master and slave? For one, I say none. At a meeting of the Liberty Party, held in the Tremont Temple, at which Judge Jay was present, and in his speech asked, if they got the power what they were going to do? I answered him, in some resolutions I had prepared, without knowing he was to make any speech, and argued the doctrine, in my speech, that we meant to enforce the writ of Habeas Corpus, and the action of Assault and Battery; the former being secured in the body of the Constitution, and the latter in the 4th article of the Amendments. In doing so, it was observed we owed no money to South Carolina, or the Southern States, they having agreed to this clause and this amendment, and Mr. Jay did not object and I know not that he has since. Certainly there is no reason why these clauses should not be enforced, as well as the one relating to the fugitive from service, or any of the other clauses of the Constitution; and if they were so, where would Slavery be? the clause securing the privilege of the Habeas Corpus, comes first in the order of time, and it may be supposed, there is no court but is sufficiently well learned, but must know if that writ was in operation, there could be no Slavery, and, consequently, the power of the Courts to entertain the subject should be denied. It is their province to see to it, that no man is held in illegal restraint, and to give him a discharge if he is so held; but the pretended ownership of a man under a constitution that refused to recognise property in man can certainly be no cause of action, as was supposed by the court in the case of Prigg vs. the State of Pennsylvania.

Will Judge Jay explain, if this is not correct doctrine?

Yours, truly,
G. W. F. MELLEN.

TWENTY-FIVE persons have lost their lives in our streets, within the last ten days, from *coup de soleil*.

——A Mrs. WEED, of Stamford, Ct., came to her death a few days since, by the use of Chloroform in the extraction of a tooth.

——Rev. CALVIN COLTON, author of "Public Economy for the United States," has been appointed Professor of Political Economy in Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

——PETITIONS were presented recently to the British Parliament from Jamaica, Antigua, St. Kitts, British Guiana and the Mauritius, complaining of the distressed condition of those colonies, and assigning the Sug

## Miscellaneous Department.

THE Address which follows was made at a public meeting held in this city, a few evenings since, and called on behalf of the family of Governor Kossuth, who, having been released by the Austrian Government, are now on their way to find an asylum in the United States. It is by far the most eloquent speech made by M. Kossuth in this country, and, as we are not restricted in its application, very properly finds a place in a paper devoted to the great Christian work of the Emancipation of the American Slaves.

ADDRESS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—During six months I appeared many times before the tribunal of public opinion in America. This evening I appear before you in the capacity of a working man. My aged mother, tried by more sufferings than any living being on earth; and my three sisters, one of them a widow with two fatherless orphans; together a homeless family of fourteen unfortunate souls, have been driven by the Austrian tyrant from their home, that Golgotha of murdered right, that land of the oppressed, but also of undesponding braves, and the land of approaching revenge. When Russian violence, aided by domestic treason, succeeded to accomplish what Austrian perjury could not achieve, and I with bleeding heart went into exile, my mother and all my sisters have been imprisoned by Austria; but it having been my constant maxim not to allow to whatever member of my family any influence in public affairs, except that I intrusted to the charitable superintending of my youngest sister the hospitals of the wounded heroes, as also to my wife the cares of providing for the furniture of these hospitals, not even the foulest intrigues could contrive any pretext for the continuation of their imprisonment. And thus, when diplomacy succeeded to fetter my patriotic activity by the internation to far Asia, after some months of unjust imprisonment, my mother and sisters and their family have been released; and though surrounded by thousand spies, tortured by continual interference with their private life, and harassed by insulting police measures, they had at least the consolation to breathe the native air, to see their tears falling upon native soil, and to rejoice at the majestic spirit of our people, which no adversities could bend and no tyranny could break.

But see at last the humanity of the Sultan, backed by American generosity, seconded by England, I once more was restored to personal freedom, and by freedom to activity. Having succeeded to escape the different snares and traps which I unexpectedly met, I considered it my duty publicly to declare that the war between Austrian tyranny and the freedom of Hungary is not ended yet, and swore eternal resistance to the oppressors of my country, and declared that, faithful to the oath sworn solemnly to my people, I will devote my life to the liberation of my fatherland. Scarcely reached the tidings of this my after resolution the bloody Court of Vienna, then two of my sisters were again imprisoned; my poor old mother escaping the same cruelty only on account that bristling bayonets of the bloodhounds of despotism, breaking in the dead of night upon the tranquil house, and the persecution of my sisters, hurried away out of Hungary to the prisons of Vienna, threw her in a half-dying condition upon a sick bed. Again no charge could be brought against the poor prisoners, because, knowing them in the tiger's den, and surrounded by spies, I not only did not communicate anything to them about my foreign preparations and my dispositions at home, but have expressly forbidden them to mix in any way with the doings of patriotism.

But tyrants are suspicious. You know the tale about Marcius. He dreamt that he cut the throat of Dionysius the tyrant, and Dionysius condemned him to death, saying that he would not have dreamt such things in the night, if he had not thought of it by day. Thus the Austrian tyrant imprisoned my sisters, because he suspected that, being my sisters, they must be initiated in my plans. At last, after five months of imprisonment, they were released, but upon the condition that they, as well as my mother and all my family, shall leave our native land. Thus they became exiles, homeless, helpless, poor. I advised them to come to your free country—the asylum of the oppressed, where labour is honoured, and where they must try to live by their honest work.

They followed my advice, and are on their way; but my poor aged mother and my youngest sister, the widow with the two orphans, being stopped by dangerous sickness at Brussels, another sister stopped with them to nurse them. The rest of the family is already on the way—in a sailing ship of course, I believe, and not in a steamer. We are poor. My mother and sisters will follow so soon as their health permits.

I felt the duty to help them in their first establishment here. For this I had to work, having no means of my own.

Some generous friends advised me to try a lecture for this purpose, and I did it. I will not act the part of crying complainant about our misfortunes; we will bear it. Let me at once go to my task.

There is a stirring vitality of busy life about this your city of New York, striking with astonishment the stranger's mind. How great is the progress of humanity! Its steps are counted by centuries, and yet while countless millions stand almost at the same point where they stood, and some even have declined since America first emerged out of an unexplored darkness, and which had covered her for thousands of years, like the gem in the sea; while it is but yesterday a few pilgrims landed on the wild coast of Plymouth, flying from causeless oppressions, seeking but for a place of refuge and of rest, and for a free spot in the wilderness to adore the Almighty in their own way. Still in such a brief time, shorter than the recorded genealogy of the noble horse of the wandering Arab; yes, almost within the turn of the hand, out of the unknown wilderness a mighty empire arose, broad as an ocean, solid as a mountain rock, and upon the scarcely rotted roots of the primitive forest proud cities stand, teeming with boundless life, growing like the prairie's grass in spring, advancing like the steam engine, baffling time and distance like the telegraph, and spreading the pulsation of their life-tide to the remotest parts of the world; and in those cities and on that broad land a nation, free as the mountain air, independent as the soaring eagle, active as nature and powerful as the giant strength of millions of freemen.

How wonderful! What a present—and what a future yet!

Future? then let me stop at this mysterious word—the veil of unrevealed eternity!

The shadow of that dark word passed across my mind and amid the bustle of this gigantic bee-hive, there I stood with meditation alone.

And the spirit of the immovable past rose before my eyes, unfolding the misty picture rolls of vanished greatness, and of the fragility of human things.

And among their dissolving views there I saw the scorched soil of Africa, and upon that soil Thebes with its hundred gates, more splendid than the most splendid of all the existing cities of the world; Thebes, the pride of old Egypt, the first metropolis of arts and sciences, and the mysterious cradle of so many doctrines which still rule mankind in different shapes, though it has long forgotten their source. There I saw Syria, with its hundred cities, every city a nation, and every nation with an empire's might. Balbeck, with its gigantic temples, the very views of which baffle the Imagination of man, as they stand like mountains of carved rocks in the desert where for hundreds of miles not a stone is to be found, and no river flows, offering its tolerant bark to carry a mountain's weight upon, and yet there they stood, those gigantic ruins; and as we glance at them with astonishment, though we have mastered the mysterious elements of nature, and know the combination of levers, and how to catch the lightning, and to command the power of steam and of compressed air, and how to write with the burning fluid out of which the thunderbolt is forged, and how to drive the current of streams up the mountain's top, and how to make the air shine in the night like the light of the sun, and how to dive to the bottom of the deep ocean, and how to rise up to the sky—cities like New York dwindle to the modest proportion of a child's toy, that we are tempted to take the nice little thing up on the nail of our thumb, as Micromegas did with the man of wax. Though we know all this, and many things else, still, looking at the times of Balbeck, we cannot forbear to ask what people of giants was that which could do what neither the puny efforts of our skill nor the ravaging hand of unrelenting time can undo, through thousands of years. And then I saw the dissolving picture of Nineveh, with its ramparts now covered with mountains of sand, where Layard is digging up colossal winged bulls, huge as a mountain, and yet carved with the nicety of a cameo; and then Babylon, with its wonderful walls; and Jerusalem, with its unequaled temple; Tyrus, with its countless fleets; Arad, with its wharfs; and Sidon, with its labyrinth of workshops and factories; and Ascalon, and Gaza, and Beyrout, and further off Persepolis, with its world of palaces.

All these passed before my eyes as they have been, and again they passed as they now are, with no trace of their ancient greatness, but here and there a ruin, and everywhere the desolation of tombs. With all their splendour, power and might they vanished like a bubble, or like the dream of a child, leaving but for a moment a drop of cold sweat upon the sleeper's brow, or a quivering smile upon his lips; then this wiped away, dream, sweat and smile, all is nothingness.

So the powerful cities of the ancient greatness of a giant age; their very memory but a sad monument of the fragility of human things.

And yet, proud of the passing hour's bliss, men speak of the future and believe themselves insured against its vicissitudes.

And the spirit of history rolled on the misty shapes of the past before the eyes of my soul. After those cities of old came the nations of old. The Assyrians, the Chaldeans, the war-like Philistines, the commercial republics of Phœnicia and the Persians, ruling from the Indus to the Mediterranean, and Egypt becoming the centre of the universe, after having been thousands of years ago the cradle of its civilisation.

Where is the power, the splendour and the glory of all those mighty nations? All has vanished without other trace than such as the foot of the wanderer leaves upon the dust.

And still men speak of the future with proud security.

And yet they know that Carthage is no more, though it ruled Spain, and ruled Africa beyond the pillars of the Hercules down to Cerene, an immense territory, blessed with all the blessings of nature, which Hermon filled with flourishing cities of which now no trace remains.

And men speak of the future, though they know that such things as heroic Greece once did exist, glorious in its very ruins, and a source of everlasting inspiration in its immortal history.

Men speak of the future, and still they can *rehearse* the powerful colonies issued from Greece, and the empires their heroic sons have founded. And they can mark out with a finger on the map, the unparalleled conquests of Alexander; how he crossed victoriously that desert whence Semiramis, out of a countless host, brought home but twenty men; and Cyneas, out of a still larger number, only seven men. But he (Alexander) went on in triumph, and conquered India up to the Hydaspes as he conquered before Tyrus and Egypt, and secured with prudence what he had conquered with indomitable energy.

And men speak of the future, though they *know* that such a thing did exist as Rome, the Mistress of the World—Rome rising from the atomic smallness to immortal greatness, and to a grandeur absorbing the world—Rome, now having all her citizens without, and now again having all the world within her walls; and passing through all the vicissitudes of gigantic rise, wavering decline, and mournful fall. And men speak of the future still with these awful monuments of fragility before their eyes.

But it is the sad fate of humanity that, encompassing its hopes, fears, contentment and wishes, within the narrow scope of momentary satisfaction, the great lesson of history is taught almost in vain. Whatever be its warnings, we rely on our good fortune; and we are ingenious in finding out some soothing pretext to lull down the dreadful admonitions of history. Man, in his private capacity, consoles the instinctive apprehension of his heart with the idea that his condition is different from what warningly strikes his mind. The patriot feels well, that not only the present, but also the future of his beloved country, has a claim to his cares; but he lulls himself into carelessness by the ingenious consolation that the condition of his country is different—that it is not obnoxious to those faults which made other countries decline and fall; that the time is different; the character and spirit of the nation are different, its power not so precarious, and its prosperity more solid; and that, therefore, it will not share the fate of those which vanished like a dream. And the philanthropist, also, whose heart throbs for the lasting welfare of all humanity, cheers his mind with the idea that after all, mankind at large is happier than it was of yore, and that this happiness insures the future against the reverses of olden times.

That fallacy, natural as it may be, is a curse which weighs heavily on us. Let us see in what respect our age is different from those olden times. Is mankind more virtuous that it has been of yore? Why, in this enlightened age, are we not looking for virtuous inspirations to the god-like characters of these olden times? If we take virtue to be love of the laws, and of the Fatherland, dare we say that our age is more virtuous? If that man is to be called virtuous who, in all his acts, is but animated by a regard to the common good, and who, in every case, feels ready to subordinate his own selfish interest to public exigencies—if that be virtue (as indeed it is), I may well appeal to the conscience of mankind to give an impartial verdict upon the question it our age be more virtuous than the age of Codrus or of Regulus, of Decius and of Scævola. Look to the school of Zeno, the stoics of Immortal memory; and when you see them contemning alike the vanity of riches and the ambition of personal glory, impenetrable to the considerations of pleasure and of pain, occupied to promote public welfare and to fulfil their duties toward the community; when you see them inspired in all their acts by the doctrine that, born in a society, it is their duty to live for the benefit of society; and when you see them placing their own happiness only upon the happiness of their fellow men—then say if our too selfish, too material age can stand a comparison with that olden period. When you remember the politicians of ancient Greece, acknowledging no other basis for the security of the commonwealth than virtue; and see the political system of our days, turning only upon manufactures, commerce and finances, will you say that our age is more virtuous? When, looking to your own country—the best and happiest, because the best of all—you will not dissimilate in your own mind what considerations influence the platforms of your political parties; and then in contra-position will reflect upon those times when Cimon, of Athens, chosen to take part in his country's government, assembled his friends and renounced their friendship, in order that he might not be tempted by party considerations or by affections of amity, in his important duties toward the commonwealth. Then, having thus reflected, say, "Take you our own age to be more virtuous, and therefore more insured against the reverses of fortune, than these older times."

But perhaps there is a greater amount of private happiness, and by the broad diffusion of private welfare, the security of the Commonwealth is more lasting and more sure?

Caraccioli, having been Ambassador in England, when returned to Italy, said that "England is the most detestable in the world, because there are to be found twenty different sorts of religion, but only two kinds of soups with which to season meat."

There is a point in that questionable jest—materialism! curse of our age! Who can seriously speak about the broad diffusion of happiness in a country where contentment is measured according to how many kinds of sauces we can taste? My people is by far not the most material. We are not much given to the cupidity of becoming rich. We know the word "enough." The simplicity of our manners makes us easily contented in our material relations; we like rather to be free than to be rich; we look for an honourable profit, that we may have upon what to live; but we don't like to live for the sake of profit; augmentation of property and of wealth with us is not the aim ot life—we prefer tranquil, independent mediocrity to the incessant excitement and incessant toil of cupidity and gain. Such is the character of my nation; and yet, I have known a countryman of mine who blew out his brains because he had no means more to eat daily paté's de foie gras and drink champagne. Well, that was no Hungarian character; but though somewhat eccentrically, he characterized the leading feature of our century.

Indeed, are your richest money kings happier than Fabricius was, when he preferred his seven acres of land worked by his own hands to the treasures of an empire? Are the ladies of to-day, adorned with all the gorgeous splendour of wealth, of jewels, and of art, happier than those ladies of ancient Rome have been, to whom it was forbidden to wear silk and jewelry, or drive in a carriage through the streets of Rome? Are the ladies of to-day happier in the splendid parlours than the Porcias and the Cornelias have been in the homely retirement of their modest nurseries? Nay; all that boundless thirst of wealth, which is the ruling spirit of our age, and the moving power of enterprising energy, all this hunting after treasures, and all its happiest results, have they made men nobler, better, and happier? Have they improved their soul, or even their body and their health, at least so much that the richest of men could eat and digest two dinners instead of one? Or has the insatiable thirst of mankind for gain originated a purer patriotism, has it made material more devoted to their country, more ready to sacrifice for public interest? If that were the case, then I would gladly confess the error of my doubts and take the pretended larger amount of hapiness for a guarantee of the future of the commonwealth. But, ladies and gentlemen! a single word—the manner in which we use it, distorting its original meaning, often characterizes a whole century. You all know the word "*idiot*;" almost every living language has adopted it, and all languages attach to it the idea that an "idiot" is a poor ignorant, useless wretch, nearly, insane. Well, "idiot" is a word of Greek extraction, and meant with the Greek a man who cared nothing for the public interest, but was all devoted to the selfish pursuits of private profit, whatever might have been its results to the community. Oh! what an immense, what a deplorable change must have occurred in the character of humanity, till unconsciously we came to the point, that by what name the ancient Greeks would have styled those European money kings, who for a miserable profit, administer to the unrelenting despots their eternal loans, to oppress nations with, we now apply that very name to the wretched creatures incapable to do anything for themselves. We bear compassion for the idiots of to-day, but the modern editions of Greek idiotism, though loaded with the bloody scars of a hundred thousand orphans, and with the curse of millions, stand high in honour, and go on, proudly glorifying in their criminal idiotism, heaping up the gold of the world.

But I may be answered, after all, though our age be not so virtuous, and though the large accumulation in wealth has in reality not made mankind happier; still it cannot be denied, you are in a prosperous condition, and prosperity is a solid basis of your country's future. Industry, Navigation, Commerce, have so much developed, they have formed so many ties by which every citizen is linked to his country's fate, that your own material interest is a security to your country's future.

In loving your ownselves, you love you country, and in loving your country you love your ownselves. This community of public and private interest will make you avoid the stumbling block over which others fell. Prosperity is of course a great benefit; it is one of the aims of human society; but when prosperity becomes too material, it does not always guarantee the future. Paradoxical as it may appear, too much prosperity is often dangerous, and some national misfortune is now and then a good preservation of prosperity. For much prosperity makes nations careless of their future; seeing no immediate danger, they believe no danger possible; and then when a danger comes, either by sudden chance or by the slow accumulation of noxious elements, then, frightened by the idea that in meeting the danger their private prosperity may be injured or lost, selfishness often prevails over patriotism, and men become ready to submit to arrogant pretensions, and compromise with exigencies at the price of principles, and republics flatter despots, and freemen covet the friendship and indulgence of tyrants, only that things may go on just as they go, though millions weep, and nations groan; but still things should go on just as they go, because every change may claim a sacrifice, or affect our thriving private interest. Such is often the effect of too great, of too secure prosperity. Therefore prosperity alone affords yet no security.

You remember the tale of Polycrates. He was the happiest of men; good luck attended every one of his steps; success crowned all he undertook, and a friend thus spoke to him: "Thou art too happy for thy happiness to last. Appease the anger of the Eumenides by a voluntary sacrifice, or deprive thyself of what thou most valuest among all that thou possessest." Polycrates obeyed, and drew from his finger a precious jewel, of immense value, dear to his heart, and threw it into the sea. Soon after a fish was brough to his house, and his cook found the precious ring in the belly of the fish; but the friend who advised him hastened to flee from the house, and shook the dust of its threshold from his shoes, because he feared a great mischief must fall upon that too prosperous house. There is a deep meaning in that tale of Polycrates.

Machiavel says, that it is now and then necessary to recall the constituting essential principles to the memory of nations. And who is charged by Providence with this task? Misfortune! The battles of Canaë and of Thrasymene it was which recalled the Romans to the love of their fatherland; nations had till now about such things no other teacher than misfortune. They should choose to have a less afflicting one. They can have it. To point this out will be the final object of my remarks, but so much is certain, that prosperity alone is yet no security for the future, even of the happiest commonwealth. Those ancient nations have been also prosperous. They were industrious, as your nation is; their land has been covered with cities and villages, well cultivated fields, blessed with the richest crops, and crowded with countless herds spread over immense territories, furrowed with artificial roads; their flourishing cities swarmed with artists, and merchants, and workmen, and pilots, and sailors, like as New York does. Their busy labourers built gigantic water-works, digged endless canals, and carried distant waters through the sands of the desert; their mighty, energetic spirit built large and secure harbours, dried the marshy lakes, covered the sea with vessels, the land with living beings, and spread a creation of life and movement along the earth. Their commerce was broad as the known world. Tyre exchanged its purple for the silk of Serique; Cashmere's soft shawls, to-day yet a luxury of the wealthiest, the pearls of Hevila, the diamonds of Golconda, the gorgeous carpets of Lydia, the gold of Ophir and Saba, the aromatic spices and jewels of Ceylon, and the pearls and perfumes of Arabia, the myrhh, silvers, gold dust and ivory of Africa, as well as the amber of the Baltic and the tin of Thulé, appeared alike in their commerce, raising them in turn to the dominion of the world and undoing them by too careless prosperity. The manner and the shape of one or the other art, of one or other industry, has changed; the steam engine has replaced the sowing bench, and cannon replaced the catapult; but, as a whole, even your country, which you are proud to hear styled "the living wonder of the world"—yes, even your country in the new world and England in the old—England, that gigantic workshop of industry, surrounded with a beautiful evergreen garden; yes, all the dominion of the Anglo-Saxon race, can claim no higher praise of its prosperity, than when we say, that you have reproduced the grandeur of those ancient nations, and nearly equal their prosperity. And what has become of them? A sad skeleton. What remains of their riches, of their splendour, and of their vast dominions? An obscure recollection; a vain memory. Thus fal! empires; thus vanish nations, which have no better guardians than their prosperity. But "we have," will you say, "we have a better guardian, our freedom, our republican institutions; our confederation uniting so many glorious stars into one mighty galaxy—these are the ramparts of our present, these our future security."

Well, it would ill become me to investigate if there be nothing "rotten in the state of Denmark," and certainly I am not the man who could feel inclined to undervalue the divine power of liberty; to underrate the value of your democratic institutions, and the vitality of your glorious Union, It is to them I look in the solitary hours of meditation, and when overwhelmed with the cares of the patriot, my soul is groaning under nameless woes, it is your freedom's sunny light which dispels the gloomy darkness of despondency; here is the source whence the inspiration of hope is flowing to the mourning world, that down-trodden millions at the bottom of their desolation still retain a melancholy smile upon their lips, and still retain a voice in their bleeding chest, to thank the Almighty God that the golden thread of freedom is not yet lost on earth. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, all this I feel, and all this I know, reflecting upon your freedom, your institutions, and your Union but casting back my look into the mirror of the past, there I see upon mouldering ground, written with warning letters, the dreadful truth that all this has nothing new, and all this has been, and all this has never yet been proved sufficient security. Freedom is the fairest gift of Heaven; but it is not the security of itself. Democracy is the embodiment of freedom, which in itself is but a principle. But what is the security of democracy? And if you answer, "The Union is," then I ask, "And where is the security of the Union?" Yes, ladies and gentlemen, Freedom is no new word. It is as old as the world. Despotism is new, but Freedom not. And yet it has never yet proved a charter to the security of nations. Republic is no new word. It is as old as the word "Society." Before Rome itself, a Republic absorbed the world. There were in all Europe, Africa and Asia Minor, but Republics to be found, and many among them democratic. Men had to wander to far Persia if they would have desired to know what sort of thing a monarch is. And all they have perished; the small ones by foreign power; the large ones by domestic vice. And union, and confederacy, the association of societies, a confederate Republic of Republics, is also no new invention. Greece has known it, and flourished by it for a while. Rome has known it; by such associations she attacked the world. The world has known them; with them it defended itself against Rome. The so-called Barbarians of Europe, beyond the Danube and the Rhine, have known it; it was by a confederacy of union that they resisted the ambitious mistress of the world. Your own country, America, has known it; the traditionary history of the Romans of the West, of these six Indian Nations, bears the records of it, out of an older time than your ancestors settled in this land; the wise man of the Onondaga Nation has exercised it long before your country's Legislators built upon that basis your independent home. And still it proved in itself alone no security to all those nations who have known it before you. Your own fathers have seen the last of the Mohawks burying his bloody tomahawk in the name-sake flood, and bare his head to the majestic words of Logan, spoken with the dignity of an Emilius, that there exists no living being on earth in the veins of whom one drop of the blood of his race did flow. Well, had history nothing else to teach us, than that all what the wisdom of men did conceive, and all that his energy has executed through all the innumerable days of the past, and all that we take to be glorious in nations and happy to men, cannot so much do as to insure a future even to such a flourishing Commonwealth as yours: then weaker hearts may well ask, what good is it to warn us of a fatality which we cannot escape; what good is it to hold up the mournful monuments of a national mortality to sadden our heart, if all that is human must share that common doom? Let us do as we can, and so far as we can, and let the future bring, what bring it may. But that would be the speech of one having no faith in the all-watching Eye, and regarding the eternal laws of the universe not as an emanation of a bountiful providence, but of a blind fatality, which plays at hazard with the destinies of men. I never will share such blasphemy. Misfortune came over me, and came over my house, and came over my guiltless nation; still I never have lost my trust in the Father of all. I have lived the days when the people of my oppressed country went along weeping over the immense misfortune that they cannot pray, seeing the downfall of the justest cause and the outrageous triumph of the most criminal of all crimes on earth; and they went along not able to pray, and weeping that they are not able to pray. I shuddered at the terrible tidings in the desolation of my exile; but I could pray, and sent the consolation home, that I do not despair; that I believe in God, and trust to his bountiful Providence, and ask them who of them dares despair when I do not? I was in exile, as I am now, but arrogant despots were debating about my blood, my infant children in prison, my wife, the faithful companion of my sorrows and my cares, hunted like a noble deer, and my sisters in the tyrant's fangs, red with the blood of my nation, and the heart of my aged mother breaking, about the shatterd fortunes of her house, and all of them at last homeless wanderers, cast to the winds, like the yellow leaves of a fallen tree; and my fatherland, my dear beloved fatherland half murdered, half in chains, and humanity nearly all oppressed, and those who are not yet oppressed looking with compassion at our sad fate, but taking it for wise policy not to help, and the sky of freedom dark on our horizon, and darkening fast over all, and nowhere a ray of hope; a lustre of consolation nowhere, and still I did not despair; and my faith to God, my trust to Providence has spread over my down-trodden land. I therefore who do not despair of my country's future, though it be overwhelmed with misfortunes, I certainly have an unwavering faith in the destinies of humanity, and though the mournful example of so many fallen nations instructs us, that neither the diffusion of knowledge, nor the progress of industry, neither prosperity, nor power, nay, not even freedom itself, can secure a future to nations, still I say there is one thing which can secure it; there is one law the obedience to which would prove a rock upon which the freedom and happiness of nations may rest sure to the end of their days. And that law, ladies and gentlemen, is the law proclaimed by our Saviour; that rock is the unperverted religion of Christ. But while the consolation of this sublime truth falls meekly upon my soul like as the moonlight falls upon the smooth sea, I humbly claim your forbearance, ladies and gentlemen; I claim it in the name of the Almighty Lord, to hear from my lips a mournful truth. It may displease you; it may offend, but still truth is truth. Offended vanity may blame me; power may frown at me, and pride may call my boldness arrogant, but still truth is truth, and I, bold in my unpretending humility, will proclaim that truth; I will proclaim it from land to land and from sea to sea; I will proclaim it with the faith of the martyrs of old, till the seed of my word falls upon the conscience of men. Let come what come may, I say with Luther: God may help me, I cannot otherwise. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, the law of our Saviour, the religion of Christ can secure a happy future to nations. But, alas! there is yet no Christian people on earth—not a single one among all. I have spoken the word. It is harsh, but true. Nearly two thousand years have passed since Christ has proclaimed the eternal decree of God, to which the happiness of mankind is bound, and has sanctified it with his own blood, and still there is not one single nation on earth which would have enacted into its law-book that eternal decree. Men believe in the mysteries of religion, according to the creed of their church; they go to church and they pray and give alms to the poor, and drop the balm of consolation into the wounds of the afflicted, and believe they do all that the Lord commanded to do, and believe they are Christians. No! Some few may be, but their nation is not—their country is not; the era of Christianity has yet to come, and when it comes, then, only then, will be the future of nations sure Far be it from me to misapprehend the immense benefit which Christian religion, such as it already is, has operated in mankind's history. It has influenced the private character of men, and the social condition of millions; it was the nurse of a new civilization, and softening the manners and morals of men, its influence has been felt even in the worst quarter of history—in war. The continual massacres of the Greek and Roman kings and chiefs, and the extermination of nations by them—the all-devastating warfare of the Timurs and Gengie Khans—are in general not more to be met with; only my dear fatherland was doomed to experience once more the cruelties of the Timurs and Gengis Khans out of the sacrilegious hands of the dynasty of Austria, which calumniates Christianity by calling itself Christian. But though that beneficial influence of Christianity we have cheerfully to acknowledge, yet it is still not to be disputed that the law of Christ does yet nowhere rule the Christian world.

Montesquieu himself, whom nobody could charge to be partial for republics, avows that despotism is incompatible with the Christian religion, because the Christian religion commands meekness, and despotism claims arbitrary power to the whims and passions of a frail mortal; and still it is more than 1,500 years since the Christian religion became dominant, and through that long period despotism has been pre-eminently dominant; you can scarcely show one single trusty democratic republic of any power which had subsisted but for a hundred years, exercising any influence upon the condition of the world. Constantine, raising the Christian religion to Rome's imperial throne, did not restore the Romans to their primitive virtues. Constantinople became the sewer of vice; Christian worship did not change the despotic habits of Kings. The Tituses, the Trajans, the Antonines appeared seldom on Christian thrones; on the contrary, mankind has seen, in the name of religion, lighted the piles of persecutions, and the blazing torches of intolerance; the earth overspread with corpses of the million victims of fanaticism; the fields watered with blood; the cities wrapped in flames, and empires ravaged with unrelenting rage. Why? Is it Christian religion which caused these deplorable facts, branding the brow of partly degraded, partly outraged humanity? No. It was precisely the contrary; the fact that the religion of Christ never yet was practically taken for an all over-ruling law, the obedience to which, outweighing every other consideration, would have directed the policy of nations, that fact is the source of evil, whence the oppression of millions has overflown the earth, and which makes the future of the proudest, of the freest nation, to be like a house built upon sand.

Every religion has two parts. One is the dogmatical; the part of worship; the other is the moral part.

The first, the dogmatic part belonging to those mysterious regions, which the arm of human understanding cannot reach, because they belong to the dominion of belief, and that begins where the dominion of knowledge ends—that part of religion, therefore, the dogmatic one, should be left to every man to settle between God and his own conscience. It is a sacred field, whereon worldly power never should dare to trespass, because there it has no power to enforce its will. Force can murder; it can make liars and hypocrites, but no violence on earth can force a man to believe what he does not believe. Yet the other part of religion—the moral part—is quite different. That teaches duties toward ourselves and toward our fellow men. It can be therefore not indifferent to the human family; it can be not indifferent to whatever community, if those duties be fulfilled or not, and no nation can, with full right, claim the title of a Christian nation, no government the title of a Christian government, which is not founded upon the basis of Christian morality, and which takes it not for an all overruling law to fulfill the moral duties ordered by the religion of Christ toward men and nations, who are but the community of men, and toward mankind, which is the community of nations. Now, look to those dread pages of history, stained with the blood of millions, spilt under the blasphemous pretext of religion; was it the interest to vindicate the rights and enforce the duties of Christian morality, which raised the hand of nation against nation, of government against government? No, it was the fanaticism of creed and the fury of dogmatism. Nations and governments rose to propagate their manner to worship God, and their own mode to believe the inscrutable mysteries of eternity, but nobody has yet raised a finger to punish the sacrilegious violation of the moral laws of Christ, nobody ever stirred to claim the fulfillment of the duties of Christian morality toward nations. There is much speaking about the separation of Church and State, and yet, on close examination, we shall see that there was, and there is scarcely one single Government entirely free from the direct or indirect influence of one or other religious denomination, scarcely one which would not at least bear a predilection, if not countenance with favour, one or another creed—but creed, and always creed. The mysteries of dogmatism, and the manners of worship enter into these considerations, they enter even into the politics, and turn the scales of hatred and affection; but certainly there is not one single nation, not one single government the policy of which would ever have been regulated by that law of morality which our Saviour has promulgated as the eternal law of God, which shall be obeyed in all the relations of men to men. But you say, of the direct or indirect amalgamation of Church and State proved to be dangerous to nations in Christian and for Christian times, because it affected the individual rights of men, and among them, the dearest of all, the liberty of conscience and the freedom of thought. Well, of this danger at least the future of your country is free; because here, at least, in this, your happy land religious liberty exists. Your institutions left no power to your Government to interfere with the religion of your citizens. Here every man is free to worship God as he chooses to do.

And that is true, and it is a great glory of your country that it is true. It is a fact which entitles to the hope that your nation will revive the law of Christ even on earth. However, the guaranty which your Constitution affords to religious liberty is but a negative part of a Christian government. There are besides that positive duties to be fulfilled. He who does no violence to the conscience of man, has but the negative merit of a man doing no wrong; but as he who does not murder does not steal and does not covet what his neighbour's is, but by not stealing, not murdering, not coveting what our neighbour's is, we did yet no positive good; a man who does not murder has not yet occasion to the title of virtuous man. And here is precisely the infinite merit of the Christian religion. While Moses, in the name of the Almighty God, ordered but negative decrees toward fellow-men, the Christian religion commands positive virtue. Its divine injunctions are not performed by not doing wrong; it desires us to do good. The doctrine of Jesus Christ is sublime in its majestic simplicity. "Thou shalt love God above all, and love thy neighbour as thou lovest thyself."

This sublime doctrine is the religion of love. It is the religion of charity. "Though I speak with the tongues of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Though I have the gift of propheoy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and have all faith, so that I could remove mountains and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." Thus speaks the Lord, and thus speaking he gives the law. "Do unto others as thou desirest others to do unto thee." Now in the name of Him who gave this law to humanity, to build up the eternal bliss and temporal happiness of mankind, in the name of that Eternal Legislator, I ask, is in that *charity*; in that fundamental law of Christianity, any limit of distinction drawn in man in his power, and man in his natural capacity? Is it but a law for a man where he is alone, and can do but little good? Is it no law more where two are together, and can do more good; no law more when millions are together? Am I in my personal adversities; is my aged mother in her helpless desolation; are my homeless sisters whom you feed to-day, that they may work to-morrow; are we your neighbours, unto whom you do as you would others in a similar position do unto yourself? And is every one of my down-trodden people a neighbour to every one of you; but all my people collectively, is it not a neighbour to you? And is my nation not a neighbour to your nation? Is my down-trodden land a neighbour to your down-trodden land? Oh! my God, men speak of the Christian religion and style themselves Christians, and yet make a distinction between virtue in private life and virtue in public life; as if the divine law of Charity would have been given only for certain small relations, and not for all the relations between men and men.

"There he is again, with his eternal complaints about his country's wrongs;" may perhaps somebody remark: "This is an assembly of charity, assembled to ease his private woes of family, and there he is again speaking of his country's wrongs, and alluding to our Foreign policy, about which he knows our views to be divided." Thus I may be charged.

My "private family woes!" But all my woes and all the woes of my family, are concentrated in the unwarrantable oppression of my fatherland. You are an assembly of charity, it is true; and the Almighty may requite you for it, but being a charitable assembly, can you blame me that the filial and fraternal devotion of my heart, in taking with gratitude the balm of consolation which your charity pours into the bleeding wounds ot my family, looks around to heal those wounds, the torturing pains of which you ease, but which cannot be cured but by justice and charity done to my fatherland. Shall this sad heart of mine be contented by leaving to my homeless brother and sisters the means to have their bread by honest labour, their daily bread salted with the bitter tears of exile; and shall I not care to leave them the hope that their misfortune will have an end; that they will see again their beloved home; that they will see it independent and free, and live where their fathers lived, and sleep the tranquil sleep of death, in that soil with which the ashes of their fathers mingle? Shall I not care to give the consolation to my aged mother, that when her soon departing soul, crowned with the garland of martyrdom, looks down from the home of the blessed, the united joy of the heavens will thrill through her immortal spirit, seeing her dear, dear Hungary free? Your views are divided on the subject, it may be; but can your views be divided upon the subject that it is the command of God to love your neighbours as you love yourselves? That it is the duty of Christians, that it is the fundamental principle of the Christian religion, to do unto others as you desire others to do unto you? And if there is, if there can be no difference of opinion in regard to the principle; if no one in this vast assembly—whatever be the platform of his party—ever would disclaim this principle, will any one blame me that in the name of Christ I am bold to claim the application of that principle? I should not speak of politics! Well I have spoken of Christianity. Your politics either agree with the Law of Christ, or they do not agree with it. If they don't agree, then your politics are not Christian; and if they agree, then I cause no division among you.

And I shall not speak of my people's wrongs? Oh! my people—thou heart of my heart, thou life of my life—to thee are bent the thonghts of my mind, and they will remain bent to thee, though all the world may frown. To thee are pledged all the affections of my heart, and they will be pledged to thee as long as one drop of blood throbs within this heart. Thine are the cares of my waking hours; thine are the dreams of my restless sleep. Shall I forget thee, but for a moment? Never! Never! Cursed be the moment, and cursed be I in that moment, in which thou wouldst be forgotten by me!

Thou art oppressed, O my fatherland! because the principles of Christianity have not been executed in practice; because the duties of Christianity have not been fulfilled; because the precepts of Christianity have not been obeyed; because the law of Christianity did not control the policy of nations; because there are many impious governments to offend the law of Christ, but there was none to do the duties commended by Christ,

Thou art fallen oh my country, because Christianity has yet to come; but it is not yet come—nowhere! Nowhere on earth! And with the sharp eye of misfortune peircing the dark veil of the future, and with the tongue of Cassandra relating what I see. I cry it out to high Heaven and shout it out to the Earth, "Nations proud of your momentary power; proud of your freedom; proud of your prosperity. Your power is vain, your freedom is vain, your industry, your wealth, your prosperity are vain; all this will not save you from sharing the mournful fate of those old nations not less powerful than you, not less free, not less prosperous than you, and still fallen, as you yourself will fall, all vanished as you will vanish, like a bubble thrown up from the deep! There is only the law of Christ, there are only the duties of Christianity which can secure your future, by securing at the same time humanity.

Duties must be fulfilled, else they are an idle word. And who would dispute that there is a positive duty in that law "Love thy neighbour as thou lovest thyself?" Do unto others as thou wouldst that others do unto thee. Now, if these are duties in that law comprised, who shall execute them, if free and powerful nations do not execute them? No government can meddle with the private relations of its millions of citizens so much as to enforce the positive virtue of Christian charity in the thousand fold complications of private life. That will be impossible; and our Saviour did not teach impossibilities. By commanding charity toward fellow men in human relation, he commanded it also to Governments. It is in their laws toward their own citizens; it is in their policy towards other nations, that governments and nations can fulfil those duties of Christianity; and what they can, that they should. How could governments hope to see their own citizens and other nations observing toward them the positive duties of Christian morality, when they themselves do not observe them against others; when oppressed nations, the victims, not of their own faults, but of the grossest violation of the law of Christ, look in vain around to find out a nation among Christian nations, and a government among Christian governments, doing unto them, in the hour of their supreme need, as the Saviour said that it is duty to do unto others in every case.

Yes, gentlemen, as long as the principles of Christian morality are not carried up into the international relations—as long as the fragile wisdom of political exigences overrules the doctrines of Christ, there is no freedom on earth firm, and the future of no nation sure. But let a powerful nation, like yours, raise Christian morality into its public conduct, that nation will have a future against which the very gates of Hell itself will never prevail. The morality of its policy, will react upon the morality of its individuals, and preserve it from domestic vice, which, without that policy, ever yet has attended too much prosperity, and ever yet was followed by a dreadful fall. The morality of its policy will support justice and freedom on earth; and thus augmenting the number of free nations, all acting upon the same principle, its very future will be placed under the guarantee of them all, and preserve it from foreign danger—which is better to prevent than to repel. And its future will be placed under the guarantee of the Almighty himself, who, true to his Eternal Decrees, proved through the downfal of so many mighty nations, that He always punished the fathers in the coming generations; but alike bountiful as just